WHAT IS DIPLOMACY?

Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Eileen

with love from her father

Charles. W. Hayward.

Xmas. 1915.

WHAT IS DIPLOMACY?

By the same Author *Price 1s. paper; 1s. 6d. cloth*

WAR AND RATIONAL POLITICS

"This is a seriously written brochure by Charles W. Hayward against war. He regards war as simple lunacy, and deplores its folly and its wastefulness, and urges a recourse to rational politics, so that wars may be brought everywhere to an end. There is nothing of the 'Little Englander' about Mr Hayward, and he brings forward many powerful arguments on his side. I have read what he has to say with care and interest, and agree with him that only when strife and hatred have been cast aside as unworthy shall man attain to his true and noble stature."—"Harrow Gazette."

"The great trouble to the pacifist who is anxious to put his thoughts to paper in these times is the patriotic necessity of steering clear of anything that might be looked upon as casting discredit upon our own part in the war. Mr Hayward has made a bold effort to keep to the fair way. Against war in general he throws the whole weight of powers as a dialectician, and in the prayer of this book makes a strong plea for more frequent resort to rational method in the conduct of international relationships. . . . Nevertheless, what Mr Hayward has to say in a very readable book carries conviction. The appeal to reason cannot be wholly rejected by religionists, and it is probably certain that the author has got at much of the truth underlying the immediate causes of the war. . . . As we have said before, there may be differences of opinion in the resolving of the issues in terms of reason; still, the book is convincing in many ways."—"Merthyr Express."

By the same Author *Cloth, 2s. net*

ANTHONY: THE PHILOSOPHER

"'Anthony' is a blank verse drama, which at times recalls the polished workmanship and involved thought of 'Festus.'"—"Manchester City News."

"Messrs Sherratt and Hughes, London, have sent out a small volume, containing a play in three acts of vigorous and flowing blank verse, by Charles W. Hayward, entitled 'Anthony: The Philosopher.' The play seems too languid in action and too introspective to fit the modern stage; but it reads well always, and makes an interesting book."—"Scotsman."

Mr PHILIP SNOWDEN, M.P. (*quoted in* "The Daily Citizen) *writes: "I would like your drama, 'Anthony,' to be widely known. It is not only a work of rare literary ability, but it teaches great moral lessons. It is an inspiration to battle for social justice, and an encouragement to those who may be inclined to despair under the feeling that wrong cannot be overcome."*

". . . the verses are even and musical, and in some cases they recall the ideas and the diction of the old Roman classics."—"Liverpool Daily Post."

ALSO

WAR, CONSCRIPTION, ARMAMENTS and SANITY

Paper covers, 6d. net

WHAT IS DIPLOMACY?

BY

CHARLES W. HAYWARD

LONDON
GRANT RICHARDS LTD.
ST MARTIN'S STREET
LEICESTER SQUARE
MDCCCCXVI

PRINTED BY THE RIVERSIDE PRESS LIMITED
EDINBURGH

D
511
H33w

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 7

SECTION I. DIPLOMACY AND NATIONALITIES . 15

SECTION II. THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICES AND THEIR METHODS 33

SECTION III. CONSIDERATION OF ONE CHARACTERISTIC EXAMPLE OF THE DIPLOMATIC SYSTEM 104

SECTION IV. DIPLOMACY ENGENDERS FALSE IDEALS AND PERVERTED MORALITY; AND HAS SERIOUSLY DEBASED THE AMBITIONS AND MORAL TONE OF EVERY NATION . 133

SECTION V. 'TREITSCHKE EXPOUNDED. BERNHARDI EXPLAINED.' AND BOTH CRITICISED . 180

SECTION VI. THE EVANGELIST EXPLAINS THAT HIS GOSPEL WAS MERELY A DREAM PICTURE, AND HIS PROPHECIES INTENDED AS LAMENTATIONS 230

SECTION VII. REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE, AND DEMAND FOR A VERDICT OF 'GUILTY' . 249

1026613

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/whatisdiplomacy00hayw

FOREWORD

WHAT is diplomacy? It dominates that part of political life which concerns the destinies of the greatest number of millions of the human race. It controls a human relationship which has been, and still is, the most powerful and the most prolific of all in producing disasters and miseries; yet which could be, and ought to be, the most pregnant with blessings for each individual amongst these millions.

Yet despite this, it is the one department of politics concerning which there is the most colossal ignorance.

The result of this universal ignorance is that while progress has taken place, as education advanced, in other departments of public life, diplomacy still survives in the most disgracefully primitive condition of the darkest ages of ignorance.

As in early centuries men, through ignorance, did not question the power of the medicine-men or priests to discuss and control the destinies of their souls, and dictate according to their whims whether each man's eternity was to be spent in some heaven or hell, so the democracies still, through ignorance, submit to a similarly fraudulent claim upon the part of political medicine-men or priests to use their whims or class interests unquestioningly to decide whether their present existence shall consist of earthly embodiments of either this hell or heaven.

I am not arguing that the ignorance of the peoples of former times was their crime, any more than that the present ignorance of diplomacy or international relationships is the result of universal criminal propensities. It is a calamity, and when once recognised, its continuance is a disgrace.

I do not maintain that those who wielded authority

in the ancient religious despotisms were not convinced that they were acting rightly, any more than I question that our diplomatists may honestly believe that their monopoly is the proper arrangement.

But I do most emphatically claim that in both cases there is nothing whatever except ignorance to be offered either as explanation or excuse.

In both cases the peoples were too ignorant to be conscious of their own rights and to demand their mental freedom; and the ruling castes were too ignorant to recognise that their claims had no basis whatever except class prejudice exploiting the docile ignorance which submitted to them.

As it required the horrors of the holy inquisition, the atrocities of the massacres, the cruelties of martyrdom, the silly infatuation of the crusades, and the oppressions and robberies of the self-appointed divine regents upon earth, to stimulate the peoples to throw off their ignorant servility and rescue their souls and imaginations from slavery, so it has taken past wars, years of degrading oppressions and tortures in the worship of the false twin deity of Brute Force and Hatred, culminating in the present ghastly demonstration of the failure of both religion and civilisation, to arouse the peoples to the recognition of their political ignorance, and the equally ignorant class domination.

Those of us who have recognised the dangers of the present popular ignorance concerning diplomacy possess one advantage over those who led the revolt against the ignorance which was responsible for the calamities in the earlier instance. This advantage is that we have means by which we can appeal to the peoples, and help to dispel ignorance, which were not at the disposal of our prototypes.

This fact is the explanation of the present book.

I offer it as an explanation, but in no sense as an excuse.

Considering the appalling calamity now horrifying mankind with its barbarous atrocities, I consider that the highest duty I could attempt is to do what I can

to demonstrate the inherent dangers of present conditions: to show the peoples the actual thing itself which class restrictions and ancient traditions still attempt to bolster up as above their mental capabilities; and to call upon each member of every democracy to learn for himself, to judge for himself; to honestly decide for himself, and then to insist, by means of converse, action and every possible means, upon absolute freedom, and the same knowledge and control of every international relationship as he now exercises, or may in the future exercise, over national politics.

Of course I expect to hear a repetition of the parrotcry: 'There should be no discussion upon such a subject until the war is over!' This is not a criticism, but a paltry begging of the whole question.

The issue is so vital to the whole human race, and the present calamity, due to the failure of diplomatic negotiations, so repulsive and disastrous, that such a plea is nothing more than an excuse for cowardice, or an interested attempt to maintain the present subjection to false ideals.

The falsity of these ideals is now being recognised. Mr Asquith has said, in regard to the present war: 'It ought to mean, perhaps by a slow and gradual process, the substitution for force, for the chaos of competition, for groupings and alliances, and a precarious equipoise, the substitution for all these things of a real European partnership, based on the recognition of equal right and established and enforced by a common will.'

Sir Edward Grey (in exhibit 101, English White Paper) said: '. . . And I will say this: If the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavour will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately. I have desired this and worked for it, as far as I could, through the last Balkan crisis, and, Germany having a corresponding object, our relations sensibly improved. The

idea has hitherto been too Utopian to form the subject of definite proposals, but if this present crisis, so much more acute than any that Europe has gone through for generations, be safely passed, I am hopeful that the relief and reaction which will follow may make possible some more definite rapprochement between the Powers than has been possible hitherto.'

Lord Haldane has publicly expressed the opinion and hope, in an interview, that 'secret diplomacy must go.'

Those of us who have studied the history of the Vienna Congress, the intervening European crises, and especially the different governmental publications regarding the failure of diplomatic negotiations leading to the present war, consider that Sir Edward Grey was far too sanguine when he stated that although it had hitherto been 'too Utopian,' he still hoped for improvements.

Such a course of study impels conviction that it is absolutely hopeless to expect that justice and reason will be introduced into diplomacy by the diplomats themselves. An enlightened public opinion in each nation must force the abandonment of the present abuses.

To assist this education of public opinion, and to induce it to definitely and decisively demand truth, justice and candour in place of present prevarication, despotic robbery of democracy's rights, and secrecy, is a duty and an honour which defies appeals for cowardly silence or threats of material injury or social ostracism.

C. W. H.

LIVERPOOL.

August 1915.

After the rest of this book was written, General von Bernhardi published a series of articles in the Press in which he attempted to explain away the teaching of his former publication, *Deutschland und der Nachste Krieg.*

Up to this time the world had regarded this book as a serious exposition of the Prussian mind. General von Bernhardi has been content to permit this estimate to remain, and to wear the laurels, from October 1911, for three years, until, in October 1914, an American agency

thought well to write and ask him to explain the hitch in the programme he had thus elaborately announced. In a letter, dated 'Posen, 20/11/14,' Bernhardi replied that as he was on active service it was necessary for him to procure the Kaiser's especial permission, and for this he had already written to headquarters.

The result of this request, and of this Kaiser's 'especial permission' was the series of articles reprinted and published under the title of *The New Bernhardi.*

I have added a short section criticising this publication, and need state here merely the fact that Bernhardi now stands self-convicted. His two books are so antagonistic that, if one be the truth, the other must necessarily be a lie. It matters not which way Bernhardi may run upon this only two-way track.

If *Deutschland und der Nachste Krieg* was the expression of a sincere Prussian mind, then Bernhardi was doing what he considered to be his duty to his own nation, and is now attempting an impudent fraud upon the rest of the civilised world. Should Bernhardi desire us to believe his newer publication, and claim (as he does claim), that it embodies his true belief, then he is self-convicted of a gross swindle and criminal prostitution of his own nation in October 1911.

Between these only possible two alternatives Bernhardi himself must make his own choice.

While revising this book for publication, a remarkable work has been published in Switzerland. It is written anonymously, for obvious reasons, by a loyal and clear-sighted German, and carries with it every evidence of the honesty, courage, high education and scientific training of its author.

Would that each nation possessed many such conscientious leaders of thought as this author of *J'Accuse*, first published under the authority of Dr Anton Suter of Lausanne (dated April 20, 1915), and of which the English translation was published by Messrs Hodder & Stoughton in the last days of July.

It is naturally gratifying to me to find that this undoubted authority fully corroborates my estimate of

the Kaiser's personality and influence, the criminal activities of the Prussian military caste and financial armament interests, and the lamentable submission to fraud along with the easy acquiescence in their own befoolment shown by the otherwise estimable—if too good-natured—German peoples.

The fact of this corroboration removes the sting of attacks made upon what I wrote concerning this phase of the subject in *War and Rational Politics.*

In *J'Accuse* the author follows out with merciless candour the negotiations and the negotiators in the diplomatic juggling, the failure of which is the present degrading international fratricidal holocaust.

Anybody who reads both *J'Accuse* and this book will find that they run almost parallel where I am treating the same period (Section II.). A little consideration will demonstrate that the only real difference is that the author of *J'Accuse* deals with the subject as it concerns the diplomatic NEGOTIATORS themselves, whereas I consider it more just to regard it from the standpoint of the diplomatic SYSTEM itself.

I quite agree that the personal blame is correctly traced and justly apportioned in this truly patriotic German work.

But the system is greater than its manipulators.

It is a pernicious and dangerous anachronism, and the conviction, removal and punishment of its present exponents will not prevent future wars, due to its malevolent entanglements of future diplomatists, be they never so honest and single-minded.

Far-seeing as is the author of *J'Accuse*, I am of opinion that he has not seen deeply enough into the obscure depths of this international devil's cave.

The lack of this ultimate analysis has, in my opinion, led him into the one error he has committed, and has betrayed his anxious and transparent honest sense of justice to outstrip its true limits, until his very anxiety has made him, upon one or two points, almost unjust.

The instances upon which I rely for this criticism will be found in Section II., in which I deal with the

diplomatic system: but I must shortly indicate them here, and ask the reader to judge between us. On pages 280-281, he maintains that the active participation of the English fleet in defending the coast of a belligerent country is NOT an unfriendly act to the other belligerent, who has a perfect right to make war upon his antagonist's country, but who is thereby actively opposed or thwarted by this NEUTRAL (!) Power.

On page 282, he states that England had NOT departed from strict neutrality on 2nd August 1914.

I maintain that he is wrong, and that if England repelled the German fleet from the coast of France during active hostilities between France and Germany, she was NOT neutral, and thereby herself opened active war upon Germany. England's distinct promise to France, given after the Cabinet meeting on the morning of 2nd August (see English White Book No. 148) constituted England an active ally of France and opponent of Germany immediately hostilities should commence.

Again, he repeats the statement that it was solely Belgian neutrality which drew England into this war. I have shown that Sir Edward Grey himself informed Germany that England would come in IF FRANCE WERE ATTACKED, and that this definite threat was uttered BEFORE Sir E. Grey had asked France and Germany whether they would respect the neutrality of Belgium.

The author of *J'Accuse* makes an incorrect statement when he says that Germany could have avoided war with England on 4th August 1914.

This could not be even imagined unless Germany submitted to the impossible conditions of dry-docking the entire German fleet and waging war upon France, wearing padded gloves, while France was at liberty, and encouraged by us, to use her bare fists!

France herself welcomed England's promise of active protection by her fleet as 'of value to us.'

It, therefore, automatically constituted England the active ally of France.

And finally, on pages 332-333, the author's commendable anxiety to fix the blame upon the personalities

really responsible causes him to confuse the diplomatic evidence in regard to the Russian and Austrian mobilisations, of which each more or less surreptitious step on either side but challenged further steps by the other, with resulting mutually inflicted goadings towards war and mutually progressing burning of boats which would have provided the only possible retreat to the maintenance of peace.

In the Tsar's telegram to the Kaiser, dated 30th July 1914, he distinctly states that 'the military measures now taking form were decided upon five days ago, and for the reason of defence against the preparations of Austria.'

This definitely fixes that Russia decided mobilisation against Austria upon 25th July 1914, a point entirely overlooked by the author of *J'Accuse* when he emphasises the Austrian general mobilisation—which could only be against Russia—as taking place on the night of 30-31st July.

Subject to my criticism that these blemishes are due to the treatment of the question upon the first-floor plane of the diplomatic PERSONALITIES, and the neglect to carry the investigations down to the rotten foundation of the whole diplomatic SYSTEM, I most earnestly recommend readers to study carefully this startlingly sane study of the diplomatic system, with its subterranean poisoning of the wells of justice and honour.

The inevitable result of this SYSTEM is the plague of madness and brutality now transforming the picked manhood of Europe into mangled corpses; the fair lands into universal graveyards of corruption, the inhuman horror of which is emphasised by shattered and blackened tombstones of devastated cities, watching like ghostly scarecrows over the harvest of diabolical infamy.

C. W. H.

LIVERPOOL.

SECTION I

DIPLOMACY AND NATIONALITIES

'"Reason" is the only hope for the future.'

IN *The Standard Dictionary*, I find diplomacy defined as follows :—1. The art or science which has to do with the transaction of business between Sovereign States by means of accredited agents and according to international law ; the method of procedure employed in the management of international negotiations. 2. The practice of conducting such negotiations : the official intercommunication of governments through diplomatic agents. 3. Tact, shrewdness or skill in conducting any kind of negotiations or in social matters.

I am considerably relieved to find that there is nothing here which has been outraged during past or recent years.

You will notice that there is no hint that common-sense, reason, or honesty are either of them a necessary ingredient.

'Accredited agents' are appointed, and this term will cover both the honest man who strove to ward off this war, and the opposite kind, who either lied flatly, protested too much or skipped out of the way so as to be able to do dirty tricks, and still flatter themselves that others would think it was due to an 'unfortunate occasion' or the 'bad luck' that So-and-so, 'being on leave, did not happen to be in —— just at this crisis,' while the real truth was that this dodge had been cunningly engineered.

'According to international law' is also wide enough, as one of the main duties of diplomatists seems to be to explain that no such thing exists. When any shadow of ordered relationships, which might be so regarded,

seems to promise substance, there are as many contradictory interpretations as there are diplomatists who trouble to discuss the question. Should any such be indignant at this estimate, I would ask him, if international law is, or could be made, a reality—how is it that when something truly sensible is proposed, like the limitation of armaments, a united chorus goes up that the thing is impossible ? Is this impossibility due to incompetence within the conference, or a pulling of strings by filthy lucre outside its doors ?

'Method or procedure of conducting . . .' cannot be questioned, as it covers anything, from a delicate proposal of marriage to garotting and annexing a watch and chain.

Definition 2 gives us nothing but another statement of the same qualities, but

Definition 3 is really interesting. 'Tact, shrewdness or skill in conducting any kind of negotiations or in social matters.'

I am glad that qualities were selected for mention which certainly are essential for diplomacy, and which are elastic enough to stretch downwards sufficiently to include the motive powers of diplomacy.

You will notice that the essential qualities specified imply no trace of either morality or immorality.

Whether diplomacy is an honest calling, or a swindler's profession, depends upon the personal character of the 'agent,' and the resultant moral, or immoral, force from the combined forces of any one national clique.

'Tact' may be invaluable in diplomacy, but it is equally vital, and far more cultivated by the confidence trickster.

'Shrewdness' is a good quality for the diplomatist, but rarely is as serviceable to him as to the rigger of the money market.

'Skill' is good in all trades, including that of a pickpocket.

Were these three servants commanded by the one master of honest reason, all would be well, but in no

single national diplomatic office is the highest personal character free from the fetters of traditions and formulas which hide the truth with falsehood, while in many of these offices, these three essentials are rampant upon a level which, in private life, would fortunately place their exponents in the criminal dock.

I intend to treat diplomacy as including the manifest relationships of states, the policies or ideals producing these manifestations; and the attitude of the democracies which approve of, or at any rate permit, the political conditions under which such national policies or ideals are formulated, and acted upon by their representatives.

In my opinion the last is the most important. The actual mosaic making up the diplomacy responsible for the European War presents a predominant pattern of deceit and lying, brutal passions, and insane delusions, out of which glisten precious fragments of honesty and unselfishness.

This mosaic was laid down by its workmen, piece by piece, in secret; each nationality being either unknowingly fouled by the criminality of its representatives or undeservedly credited with their honest merits.

The political education of the various democracies has not progressed sufficiently far, partly through their own neglect to claim their rights due to laziness or ignorance, or both combined. Again it has been actively prevented from doing so, by class and financial interests, and even by their own political friends mentally fettered by ancient customs and indefensible traditions.

The present war, like all past wars, is the result of a failure of diplomatic negotiations. The democracies knew of the approaching crisis and of the actual breakdown; but they were as powerless to prevent the breakdown as they were ignorant of the wire-pulling and dodging responsible for the quarrels leading to the calamity.

Under fair treatment, human nature is very much the same all the world over, and I do not believe that the democracy represented by the most criminal of

these diplomatic cliques would have approved of the duplicity and insanity of their representatives, any more than would the democracy represented by the most innocent clique.

The essential fault is that democracy has neither education nor opportunity at present of learning and regulating the continuous policies and negotiations. There is little satisfaction for the democracies in the fact that they are always present—and in the front row, so as to receive the full force of every explosion of diplomatic dynamite; but it is quite time that they insisted upon the right of inspection of the methods of manufacture, the carefulness or recklessness of the head and staff of the factory, and the precautions against accident or incendiarism in this ring of dynamite factories.

They should also inquire whether dynamite is the only possible product, or whether something sane and useful could not result from the same mechanism and activities. At any rate, as these democracies have of necessity to occupy the front row at each violent explosion, they deserve to have the preceding excitement of watching the whole process from the raw material to the catastrophe. It is probable that as such interested spectators they could offer valuable advice, and help to eject malevolent individuals, and place them under the same forcible restraint as the other members of society whose activities are criminal, or whose mental conditions are dangerous.

My object is to do some slight service in the education of the democracy to which I belong, and, I hope, through them to other democracies, so that they will break down the secrecy which fosters criminality, and insist upon the observance of truth and justice in the full glare of enlightened day.

I think I shall be able to show, from the official documents published by the various nations regarding the negotiations leading to the war, that lying and duplicity exercise full sway over our destinies.

From evidence of spying and other unsavoury methods

I will demonstrate that secret diplomacy embodies (1) a code of immorality which would not be tolerated for a moment in national life, and which would be repudiated by savages. (2) A moral cowardice which paralyses even the best of those who would otherwise 'play the game honestly.' (3) Licence for even the highest political personages to commit acts the meanness of which would make any gentleman kick them out of his back door yet prevents those who personally know of his meanness from exercising the honest courage of administering this just treatment.

I shall also call attention to the falsity and pettiness of the ideals and ambitions consecrated by diplomacy, and lay especial stress upon the danger of the delusions offered even by respected and influential men for the future conduct of international relationships.

This last is, in my opinion, the most important of all the points to be explained for the correct political education of the democracies; and as it will be essential to take one such delusion as an illustration, I shall devote a considerable portion of my time and space to the English embodiment of the Policy of Conquest put forward most popularly in Germany by Treitschke and Bernhardi, and which has found an enthusiastic foster-parent in England in the late Professor Cramb.

In Professor Cramb's *England and Germany*, this fatal delusion is explained and blessed throughout the whole of his teaching, until we come to the last lecture. In this he gives a fine account of what is the true and noble policy for future diplomacy, but the amazing fact remains that he offers no suggestion for the raising and preservation of this noble edifice, but cries out for the application of the old criminal dynamite and explosion, which would again bury the democracies in its shattered ruins.

Still, I regard Cramb and Bernhardi as not so dangerous as the men who say: 'If we only could abolish war, but alas . . .' etc., etc. These men agree with you that the world would be an ideal place 'IF,' etc., and having persuaded you that, 'human nature being what it is, we must all have our faults, you know, and must

fly a pirate's flag, even if only a little one—and the design really looks pretty in that size, so come along ! just let's split a half-bottle of Patriotic brand ! '

Such men are greater enemies of progress than Treitschke and Bernhardi, who come staggering up in a condition of blatant military delirium tremens, straining under the weight of the heaviest possible flag-pole, and tangled up in the folds of a seemingly endless flag, from which the piratical skull grins out above the cross-bones with a welcoming leer of patronising familiarity.

Fortunately, the democracies are becoming more and more convinced that mutual sobriety is a nobler aspiration than mutual delirium tremens, but these false friends who inveigle them to the patriotic drinking saloon betray them.

Had the German democracy refused all converse with such evil counsellors, they would have been free, and eager, when the Prussian inebriated pirate staggered up to the diplomatic bar, to either catch him by the scruff of his neck and run him into safe confinement, or flatten him out with a plank of common-sense. Instead of this, they lost their heads through being seen having a mild and bitter, and then, through want of moral courage, joined in the mad carouse.

There is a moral in this for distant communities, as well as for one nearer home.

It behoves those of us who recognise the truth to demonstrate that the human race would progress faster, and evolve a nobler type, were its energies and ambitions directed to bestowing upon mankind the blessings of health, comfort and happiness, than is ever possible while the false and base god of war, or so-called valour, claims the slavish worship, the highest science and the unlimited wealth of the so-called civilised nations. I desire personally to point out to each member of the democracies whom I can reach that the supposed triumphant reply of 'Where would you, and the rest of us have been if we had not increased our navy,' etc., etc., is nothing more than a cowardly begging of the whole question.

It is all right and true that their warnings and their fears certainly led us to increase our piratical possibilities equally with, or even exceeding, those of the opposition pirate, but have they been in reality friends or enemies ?

These men shout that for five or ten years they have been warning the British nation and foretelling the day of destruction. True, so they have. But have they ever done one single grain of rational work to improve international friendships ? They have not. They bray : 'Arm ye ! your neighbour hates you, and thirsts for your blood. Lay in every death-dealing machine you can, and get in the first blow ! '

They are welcome to all the credit for this kind of cleverness. What has been their help towards removing the hate, relieving the paralysing strain and preventing murder and destruction ?

They have stumped the country, perched upon financial dung-hills, and prostituted their Press to revile and slander their neighbour. All their efforts have been to inflame our nation, and in the most offensive way to insult the possible opponent, lest his anger should cool.

They have shouted themselves hoarse, and exhausted their type in flaming posters and scare-lines in their appeal to our passions.

They have cut ridiculous antics and outraged decency in their vulgar gibes addressed to our neighbour. But have they ever had one single lucid interval, in which they have ventured the remark that, except for such lamentable absence of reason as they themselves embodied, there was no imaginable obstacle to ourselves and our neighbour mutually addressing one another and saying : 'Would it not be far better if, instead of making fools of ourselves, we talked the matter over as rational human beings, and observed the same code of morals towards one another as each of us obeys in regard to other members of his limited circle ? '

Have they ever done this ? If not, why ? If they have not honestly tried this, what right have they to prance about, ejecting frothy exhortations to attain a two-power standard of devilish monstrosities for the murder

of the neighbour whom they employ every effort to provoke, but have never made the least attempt to treat with the justice and consideration due to an equally deserving fellow-man ?

Men are hypnotised by this lie that without an international war there is no valour. The truth is that the valour of a man who, in defence of some victim, stands up to a bully and takes the punishment, is a nobler type of courage than he would have got through a lifetime of military training and campaigns. And the nobility of the man who risks his life to save one human being from fire or drowning is as much superior and finer than the military qualities as is the diamond than charcoal, both the same in essential principles, but how different in the marvellousness of their development! The coarser form is very valuable, but its value is not limited to the manufacture of gunpowder, and to say that valour can only be kept alive or developed by war * is a malicious lie.

* 'Man is stunted by peaceful days,
In idle repose his courage decays.
Law is the weakling's game,
Law makes the world the same.
But in war man's strength is seen,
War ennobles all that is mean,
Even the coward belies his name.'

SCHILLER.

'I recognise in the effect of war upon national character, one of the most salutary elements in the moulding of the human race.'—W. v. HUMBOLT.

'Dreams of a peaceful day ?
Let him dream who may !
"War" is our rallying cry,
Onward to victory !'

GOETHE.

'The inevitableness, the idealism, the blessing of war, as an indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasised.'

'War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power.'

'Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they influence politics.'

Yet it has been maintained by men whose intellectual powers in other directions commanded respect, and whose morality was otherwise normal. This does not in the slightest degree interfere with the fact that the statement is a reasonless and dangerous lie; as reasonless and incomparably more dangerous than it would be to assert that charcoal cannot be used for anything else than the manufacture of death-dealing explosives.

If the inevitableness of war attaches to the backwardness of civilisation, this is no excuse for the assiduous cultivation and intensification of war, but a challenge to shove civilisation along.

Have these national advisers, as a little lower than the angels, made any honest endeavour in this direction? If not, why?

The component of mankind which is a little lower than the angels has urged him to mitigate sufferings and preserve the afflicted.

What part of him is it that at the same time urges him to select the best specimens of his race, train them to superb health and condition for no other reason than that they may be blown to pieces in thousands in passionate attempts to inflict similar atrocities upon the selected best of his fellow-men?

He knows that these opponents were recently friendly though now bearing a label issued from some diplomatic office, notifying each opposing group that the other has been classed by those officials as belligerent!

'Efforts directed towards the abolition of war are not only foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatised as unworthy of the human race.'

'Among all political sins the sin of feebleness is the most contemptible; it is the political sin against the Holy Ghost!'

TREITSCHKE.

The above quotations are quoted by Bernhardi, who suffers from the delusion that because somebody else has said something of which he approves, all that is necessary is for him to quote it between inverted commas, and that makes it indisputable gospel! Why, it does not even make it sense, to say nothing about any suggestion of truth. Still it impressed Professor Cramb, who adopted the whole platform. I quote them as proofs of a rotten link in otherwise strong mental chains.

Is such official notification adequate ground for each rational being in each group to commit murder ? If so, why ? If the bare official notice does not satisfy his reason, does he pursue inquiries until he discovers facts which satisfy his conscience that such murder is his duty ? If not, why ?

Man is a reasoning animal, a little lower than the angels, yet he can—and does, during the present war—provide the following example of moral imbecility—meet his fellows of the enemy during a few hours' truce ; fraternise ; join in song ; and unite in the toast of 'Down with war,' mutually recognising that between them personally there exists no trace of quarrel or ill feeling : yet within five minutes, and before their lips have lost the warmth of their friendly wishes, each of these men will have no other business or object in life than to murder the other with the most atrocious mutilation ! Why ?

Those who survive, or look on, condemn war in itself, but say that these men are only doing their duty. Then duty means murder ! Why ?

They further argue that it is no use protesting, as war is inevitable ! If murder is inevitable amongst reasoning beings a little lower than the angels—why is this so ?

The whole trouble is the want of rationalism as the guide to our consideration of every question of national and international relations and conduct.

Man's unique and supreme gift of reason is the one single attribute which gives him any superiority over the rest of the animal creation, and yet this gift is disgracefully neglected. A paralysing moral cowardice forbids him honestly to apply this reason, and fearlessly follow the upward path along which it would lead him. Slavish worship of established customs, or ancient traditions, make him shrink with terror from the task of questioning their credentials. In this way he has become the abject prisoner of false ideals and perverted morality, and has given his soul into the bondage of barbaric chains and ignorant prejudices.

How completely this proceeding has enslaved him is demonstrated by the fact of the abortion of every truly beneficent development in order that the intensive cultivation of irrational passions and prejudices may be fostered. For the cultivation of new hatreds, bloodshed and destruction, he has lavished genius and wealth which would have abolished every one of the abuses and iniquities which still blot civilisation and render existence precarious and filled with suffering for the majority of each separate nation. The worship of these irrational and false ideals has rendered his philanthropy a mockery and his religion a sham.

Fortunately even this blight has not been able entirely to prevent the stunted development of education towards the freeing of his reason, and with painful efforts to battle with this crushing and unjust burden, more and more men have come to see in the freeing of reason the only hope for the future of mankind.

But the dark cloud still dims the light of this coming dawn, and few—even of the best minds—are able to break away from the old chains and enjoy the sunlight of reason—beyond the edges of this chilling shadow.

To this is due the failure of the half-hearted attempts which have yet been made for progress in both national and international morality and relations.

While some of the great intellects are still aborted by one or more persisting falsity, even those who have become sufficiently emancipated to recognise the true path fail to grasp the intense possibilities or to exercise their new-found freedom, to a courageous and triumphant conclusion.

This is responsible for the fact that while many men of great intellect, like—to take just two examples—Professor Treitschke in Germany and Professor Cramb in England—recognised the injustices and dangers of past and present history, each of them suffered from total moral blindness in regard to the only possible remedy; and, with a complete neglect of any attempt at reason, each held up the brazen serpent of brute force as the one and only god for man's worship!

My hope for the future is cheered—yet chided—by the further fact that the learned writers of by far the best and sanest book which I have seen dealing with the subject (i.e. *The War and Democracy.* Macmillan), while free from this blindness, have still failed to follow their reason to its highest and most complete power.

They have lucidly explained the past and present catastrophes as due to tyrannical oppression of, and insane disregard for, the natural and commendable aspirations of nationalities, and they look forward to the remedying of present, and the prevention of future, troubles, by the conscientious respect for and observance of these ambitions and destinies of the various nationalities.

Nationality is valuable, and the honest treatment of it is the sanest advance yet offered. But those who most wisely advocate it are still short-sighted, and do not see far enough into things. The analysis must be carried farther, the thinking must be deeper, the reasoning more persistent.

Thinking cannot be too deep, nor reasoning too persistent. There is no safe foundation, unless we have conscientiously and ruthlessly penetrated until we have reached solid, immovable rock: which has been the same since eternity, and will be the same until eternity. Nationality can never be concreted and changeless. The only attributes which have always been, and will always be the same, yesterday, to-day and for ever, are Truth and Justice and the only diamond with which humanity can cut through the overlaying strata is Reason.

The only nobility in human life is the conscientiousness with which each of us utilises this reason; the care we take to keep its cutting edge clean and sharp; and the honesty of our endeavours to employ it and penetrate through the overlying, encumbering masses of each human relationship and policy, until we arrive at the rocks of truth and justice, which are alone their true foundation.

Nationality is one of the deeper and purer strata,

beyond the rubbish of self-interest and gaudy power. But it is not the end of our labour, and he is only an incompetent workman who does not recognise that the diamond of reason cuts through this also, and finally reaches the bed-rocks of universal and impenetrable truth and justice.

We may do much by forcing mankind to penetrate to and recognise the purity of this strata of nationality; but unless we insist upon the further cutting through this to truth and justice, nationality will again slide upon this bed-rock substratum in any world-convulsion, and our new temples fall into ruins.

The man who boasts 'my country right or wrong' is still immoral. His true allegiance is to truth and justice, and if he follows his nationality in opposition to truth and justice, he is still a traitor to all that is really noble and to his true reason.

The human race is greater than its component parts, and though, for convenience, or as the result of geographical or linguistic limitations, it may be parcelled out into various groupings, or even separate communities, the ever-increasing facilities for inter-communication, the ceaseless growth of interdependence in material relationships, and the inalienable right of the whole world to equal heritage in all genius of invention, literature, art, music or science, no matter in which group its creator may reside, all tend to render the barriers of nationality less rigid, and to enforce co-operation between, or even fusion and mergence of, two or more groups in a common partnership. Any system, therefore, founded upon nationality is unstable, and may even raise new obstacles in the future.

Nationalities, like families, need to be given freedom and fair play for the nurture of the sentiment of relationship, and he who would rigidly fence off each nation in a separate pen is as great a blunderer as the parent who attempts to restrict all the interests and friendships of his children by cooping them between his own front and back doors. This class of man will not recognise that it is only an infantile development of reason which

leads him to suppose that he can mould each member of his family into the exact character-form he pleases to select as his model. With reason and honest endeavour, he can guide and help each individual to accomplish the best that is within them.

This may sometimes be less than he had hoped, but may often overshadow himself, by the unsuspected magnificence of its development due to some mysterious inheritance of super qualities. Blind domineering would have raved at and destroyed each precious trait as it budded, but true reason nurtures every advance for the benefit of the whole race.

But the man who tries to force HIS ideal rigidly upon each child is as great an idiot as the man who might attempt to force every oak upon his estate to grow of identical strength, height, thickness, foliage, inclination and number of branches and buds ! They will all be oaks, some undersized, some towers of grandeur and beauty, and had the insane methods he adopted in his family been possible, the result would only have been to atrophy the stunted individuals and abort those of vigorous inherent possibilities into horrible monstrosities.

To say that this man 'acted with the best intentions,' and 'to preserve them from outside temptations,' is not to excuse him, but to confirm the verdict that his reason is so feeble that he had no right to exercise the responsibilities essential to having any family to muddle by his incompetence.

At the other extreme, we get a crowd composed of those who shout in chorus either (1) that nationality is all bunkum, and can be crushed despotically : or (2) that it is so rigid that fusion or co-operation is impossible : or (3) alternately shout one or the other from inherent worthlessness of their faculty of reason.

The first position—*i.e.* that nationality can be crushed or slighted with impunity—has been the cause of many past wars—and rightly so. It would be as despicable for a community to permit autocratic annihilation of their national sentiment, as it would be for a man to permit his home ties, blood relationship, and childish

associations to be exterminated by a bumptious policeman.

Yet brutal bullying nations have done this, and are yet attempting it. As an instance we may take the summing up of Germany's policy in regard to the Poles of Prussian Poland :

'They should be allowed but three privileges :—(1) to pay taxes ; (2) to serve in our army ; (3) to shut their jaws ' ! *

Any nation which is so devoid of all reason and justice may well experience the amazement which seized Germany when the British colonies spontaneously rose with one wave of loyalty to the protection of the Empire, and in repudiation of such brutal kultur, in its threat to extend these insane methods throughout world-empire !

What is this bond which has caused nationalities of the widest possible varieties—including races of every type and colour, forming a combination of such heterogeneous varieties as the world has never previously seen—to rally unanimously to the defence of the British Empire ?

It is simply that owing to some characteristic trait of the British character, call it what you will, luck or genius for colonisation, the British Empire has been founded upon recognition of the fact that each child may be nursed during infancy, guided through adolescence, and lovingly advised during manhood : but that when it has attained its majority and started into the world for itself—any parent who attempts to harness it so tightly that it must advance step by step with himself, or curb it so that its young ambitions must not outpace its own older and more sedate pace—is a fool for his pains and courts inevitable friction, obstruction, and eventual rupture and separation. With reasoned justice, all nations of the earth could work out their own destinies in friendly communication, all acknowledging that the only international law, and one which all must loyally obey—is truth and justice,

* Professor Lezius, quoted by Dr Emil Reich.

formulated by unbiased reason, and observed by honest men.

It is this which marks off the British Empire from all ancient empires ; and it is the insolent and insane policy of the Prussian delusionists, from the greenest swaggering lieutenant to the theatrical war-lord—to substitute force for such national relationship, which has called forth a chorus of loyalty which is at once a pæan of praise and thankfulness for liberty, and the funeral dirge of brute force.

The British Governments have not attained the highest existing conceptions and principles of government without painful mistakes and deplorable unhappiness. England lost America—as she justly deserved to do—through a combination of two fundamental mistakes : (1) the violation of that freedom and consideration to which every nation in an empire, or community within a nation, has an inalienable birthright, and (2) the farcical fact that the British diplomacy was controlled by a clique preponderatingly incompetent, and a madman !

It is idle to speculate upon what might have been, had Britain's wisdom developed earlier, and this separation thereby been avoided. But the lesson has been learnt and taken to heart, and this is the fact that is the great credit of the British race. It is responsible for the unique success of the British Empire. That lesson saved us Canada, and substituted for the iron chains of Imperial bondage the easy and elastic ties of mutual good will and interest ; ties which gall not but which allow of mutual freedom, yet cannot be broken by such a convulsion as the present war, which —had they been the old rigid fetters—would have snapped them for ever.

This costly lesson, and the British genius for accepting it and acting upon the experience, has provided an example which has virtually revolutionised the world.

It nourished the moral courage which gave self-government to South Africa, even in face of the opposition of those at home whose only claim to their supposed superiority seems to be that they follow the aristocratic

fashion of the Bourbons, and learn nothing and forget nothing, while the purveyors of the only true (and home-made, thank the Fates!) kultur could only pronounce it a madness. Whatever madness there may have been was not upon the side of those who performed this act of bold moral courage. Its success has aroused the astonishment of the world, and Britain has again, by a valuable lesson, forwarded the truest education of the human race.

This genius for learning and gathering profit from experience is opening up a new and limitless era for India. Further, it has performed the almost miracle of making a nation voluntarily recognise an injustice and magnanimously remedy the outrageous mistake and oppression suffered by Ireland.

These conquests of peace are Britain's glory, beside which her successful wars appear as blots upon her history.

The class who maintain that nationality is rigid and imposes an indestructible barrier to mutual co-operation not only demonstrate their own irrationality, but deny the facts of history.

According to their ludicrous theory, English, Scotch and Welsh should to-day still be shouting senseless gibes at one another across the old hostile frontiers; and the United States of America ought to resemble so many separate monkey-houses, the occupants of each cage gibbering in senseless temper at those in the contiguous pens!

This curious delusion is the actuating principle of the Ulsterite agitators, and proves that they, at least, have not reason sufficient to recognise that nationality claims respect and—with fair play all round—may act as a bond of sympathy between mutually respecting co-operating communities; and that the blatant advertisement of what they call nationality as a pawn in a mean party game has indelibly stamped the nationality they advocate as a spurious monstrosity. It is essential, therefore, that we drill through nationalities with our diamond of reason, and found our new

scheme and hope upon truth and justice alone. Only these cannot be shaken or moved, and the temple raised upon such a foundation will defy the storms and earthquakes which may even yet threaten through human frailty.

SECTION II

THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICES AND THEIR METHODS

'The impossibility of walking straight, in crooked paths, hedged by irrational traditions, and guarded by secrecy.'[2]

IT is essential, at the outset, that I should emphatically state that I do not attack the diplomatic services personally.

Many of the men forming the diplomatic service in all countries, and perhaps all of the men in some countries, are individuals of the highest character. They may possess not only all the abilities necessary for the most difficult negotiations, but also the will and purpose to do their best for their nation, while maintaining the strictest honesty in all their dealings.

I make this initial statement so that, should any hostile critic accuse me of attacking the morality of the class of diplomatists, he will know, as clearly as the rest of us, that he is deliberately uttering a falsehood.

I shall certainly attack the personal character of any one or more whenever I find conclusive evidence warranting a verdict of guilty. Personally, I consider that the manner in which what are really crimes, entailing fearful consequences to democracies numbering more millions than the whole of the diplomatic services numbers in individuals, have been taken as 'all in the day's work,' hushed up in silence, and submitted to without the merited open criminal prosecution is a disgrace to all morality and a proceeding more despicable and dangerous than it would be to offer prizes for burglary and bonuses for murder.

This cultivation of crime against the human race, through the substitution of moral cowardice for self-respect, is a necessary corollary of the insane system

and ancient code which still governs diplomatic negotiations and which is still strenuously defended even by otherwise enlightened political leaders, as if this antiquated set of rules embodied a sacredness or divinity far beyond that attaching to the original Ten Commandments.

I shall attack this system all the time, and we shall recognise that it is responsible for the cultivation of a ruling code of morals in duplicity, secret dodging, cupidity and jealousies which, if worked out between these individual men strictly for themselves, would be only mean and ignorant, but which, regarded in their true light — *i.e.* being multiplied as many times in extent and intensity as the millions of individuals affected in each nation bears to the number of actual diplomats who settle the questions which affect their existence—would make the slightest departure from true rectitude stand forth in its real perspective as an outrageous crime against humanity.

These men are in a similar position to a force at one end of a lever the proportions of which in regard to the fulcrum is anything over 'one to a million.' The least turn of their wrists, the slightest deflection from absolute rectitude, causes the other end of the lever to describe an arc which may sweep millions of individuals into poverty and destruction.

Keeping in mind, therefore, the fact that any attack is solely upon the irrational system, and the few convicted delinquents, my indictment of the present methods of international negotiations known as diplomacy is (and anyone familiar with legal documents and Blue books will agree that the counts are neither too many nor undeserved):

'That it places the lives and destinies of millions of humanity within the powers of a limited inner circle of men; that this limited circle representing each nation may in reality be controlled by one man, or dominated by a clique of two or three individuals, and that the combined circles do not afford one single representative for every eight or ten millions of those

whose lives are in their care, or at their mercy; that it is a secret conspiracy concerning which these millions have no knowledge whatever, but upon whom the whole brunt of any disaster falls; that such a crushing responsibility is unjust to, and impossible of fulfilment by, any one individual, or any limited circle of individuals were they the best and wisest men who had ever existed; that this "limited circle" is formed of individuals selected upon chance, privilege and cliques, a method which gives no guarantee that they are of even average intelligence or morality; that any limited circle of human beings exercising practically unlimited powers secretly, violates all reason, and is against human nature itself; that it is impossible for the smallest limited circle of human beings, selected in such a manner and endowed with such powers, even on the law of averages, to be free from one or more individuals unfit morally or mentally to control the destinies of anybody, even of their own families; that in such circumstances it is an unavoidable certainty that those members of the circle who honestly strive for good are rendered powerless, while those who work for evil cannot be controlled and are all-powerful; that the secrecy, license, and ancient privileges invite the basest motives and actions from those members capable of them, and award a premium to duplicity, self-interest, and the crime of gambling in other men's lives, while the confidential relationships compel all the honest members to suffer outrages upon their consciences, and insults to their self-respect; that by the acknowledged employment of such despicable methods as spying, and the suborning of traitors, it seriously lowers the morality of each nation; and that it is an irrational, archaic, extravagantly costly, and childishly be-tinselled machine for performing very badly and in secret, functions which could be done more efficiently, openly, and at a fraction of the cost by the adoption of present-day business facilities and the standard of commercial morality.'

I believe that to be a just indictment, and that there would be no difficulty in producing evidence which

would compel any fair-minded jury to return a verdict of guilty under each count.

Such a proceeding is not really necessary, as even the parties most interested in the defence and maintenance of the system would be forced to plead guilty to some of the counts, and there is such interdependence between the various statements that the proving of a few essential indictments would establish the rest and condemn the whole affair as a dangerous anachronism.

To obviate, as far as possible, multiplication and duplication, I shall content myself with a general statement of the case, in the hope that the democratic jury will administer justice by returning a verdict recording the fact that 'the character of the defendant is such that instant dismissal from the service of the nation is imperative.'

A man has to be either an aristocrat or a public official overawed by his own importance, a prospective member of the Ulster Provisional Government, an anarchist, or the major-domo of a Sunday school fife-and-drum band, in order to be incapable of recognising a trace of humour in some facet of even the sternest or most irregular proceeding. As I am unable to claim any one of these distinctions, I find many delightfully humorous aspects of this diplomacy business, while I still regret the cost in safety and wealth to my fellow-men which the very existence of it entails.

In his column, 'Sub Rosa,' in *The Daily News*, 'S. L. H.' (a true appreciator of humour) gave an account of what can claim to be known as the First Hague Conference —*i.e.* the Congress of Resuick, near The Hague, which took place in 1697, as narrated by Macaulay. Several meetings were occupied with haggling over how many carriages, horses, pages, etc., each minister was entitled to bring to Resuick; whether they should carry canes, wear swords, and other childish nonsense. As the Conference was called for the purpose of ending a war which had been going on from 1688, between France on the one hand, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Spain and others on the other hand, there is grim humour here.

Two of these buffoons gave their greatest zeal to calculating their steps so that one should not appear more dignified than the other—as if any dignity could survive such petty antics!

King Charles XI. of Sweden, whose Ambassador was President of the Conference, died early in April, but the fact could not be communicated to the Council before 12th June, because this Ambassador required all that time to collect mourning and other flummeries for himself and lackeys; and so, on that date, these diplomats went solemnly through the silly farce of announcing, with suspended grief, the three-month-old decease, to the accompaniment of simulated surprise and regret.

The humour evidently palled upon William III., as he did not wait for the end of the harlequinade, but made peace with the King of France behind their backs. Probably this was due to his knowledge of the fact that at a previous congress, at Mineguem, the same kind of foolery lasted from February 1676 to February 1679—while the war continued like an orchestral accompaniment to their inane cackle.

Of course diplomatic performances have been considerably shortened, but they still bear a strong resemblance to these ancient comedies, both in the dressing up and the long waits between the acts, as well as in the dreariness of the dialogue.

The Fifth Report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (Cd. 7748. 1914), published as recently as 18th December 1914, shows by its criticisms that many archaic remains still characterise the constitution and activities of the diplomatic service, and that proposed reforms become out of date and primitive during the delay in their consideration, and also that the chance of their adoption is almost hopeless.

The Commissioners report that the method of recruiting the diplomatic service which has been in force up to the present renders the service the special preserve of a small and privileged class, and that although some feeble attempt has been made to meet the objections

which previous Commissions had formulated, entrance was still dependent upon recommendations of a certain class of aristocratic individuals who either themselves could exercise influence or procure influence to push forward their nominees. They also strongly condemn the rule which insists upon any possible future diplomat possessing a personal income, apart from any work, of at least £400 per annum. Quite rightly they imply that, upon the presumption that the members of the diplomatic service should be of good manners and gentlemanly conduct, still as intellectual development and talent are most valuable qualities, this limitation may not be true wisdom, as while all these high qualities may exist in a high condition in many men whose parents cannot endow them with sufficient wealth to render them independent of earning anything for themselves, the possession of an unearned income of £400 or more per annum is no real guarantee that the man who is fortunate enough to enjoy it possesses also the intellectual level, talent or personal character desirable for such a responsible national position. They also complain of a certain 'cliquiness' in selection.

'The obvious criticism on this statement of facts is that, as the attaché gets no pay at all for his first two years of service, and only the wholly inadequate pay of £150 per annum for probably the ensuing four or five years, the Diplomatic Service is effectually closed to all His Majesty's subjects, be they never so well qualified for it, who are not possessed of private means. The official conditions of entry into this Service fix the amount of the private means required at a minimum of £400 a year.

'The effect is to limit candidature to a narrow circle of society. We have been furnished by the Civil Service Commissioners with the educational antecedents of the successful competitors for attachéships in the years 1908-13 inclusive (*i.e.* since the introduction of the Board of Selection in 1907). No fewer than 25 out of 37 (about 67 per cent.) came from Eton, while all but a very small fraction had

been educated at one or other of the most expensive public schools. In only one case was any University other than Oxford or Cambridge represented. No further evidence is required to show the limiting effect of the present regulations upon the class of candidates from whom the Diplomatic Corps is recruited.' *

And in regard to the practice of paying no salary to accepted candidates during the first two years of their service, they recommend that this should be remedied by paying a living wage. In calling attention to the fact that these alterations had been recommended twenty-four years ago by the Ridley Commission (1886-1890), they hit off the stodgy inertia of the whole service in the following rather pathetic paragraph :—

'This is merely a repetition of the recommendation made by the Ridley Commission twenty-four years ago. "It does not appear to us desirable," they said, "to employ young men in the regular Government Service for two years without salary, or to make a property qualification a condition of entrance." We agree with the Ridley Commission, and desire to express our surprise that the existing arrangements should have been tolerated so long.' †

That the nations of Europe are to-day suffering from the consequences of the amazingly irrational custom which places vital international questions outside the control of the respective nationalities interested, and makes them a special preserve of a lucky-bag selection of representatives restricted to a privileged class, is proved by the fact that the present deplorable calamity is merely the boiling over of the frictions, passions and revolts against injustices which were the inevitable consequences of the incompetence and the treacherous activities of the diplomatic representatives at the Vienna Congress in 1814.

As is well pointed out by Professor J. Dover Wilson,‡ the hopes and opportunities when this Congress of

* Section 12. † Section 13.
‡ *The War and Democracy*, p. 31.

diplomatists met were identical with those which will be presented for settlement when active hostilities are concluded in the present terrible barbaric struggle.

The golden opportunity of 1814 was wilfully thrown away, the noble aspirations ruthlessly smothered by injustices ; the destinies and freedom of nations wantonly sacrificed to royal and aristocratic class prejudices ; and the progress of humanity thwarted by the pernicious system of privileged diplomacy.

There could not be a more solemn duty than to ensure that a similar ghastly calamity cannot by any possibility be repeated.

I know that there are many—and these amongst the official and influential classes—who will resent present criticism, and who will be ready to utter the senseless parrot-cry that 'during such a crisis, it is the bounden duty of everybody to abstain from criticism, and loyally support the national Executive,' etc.

Personally, I gladly defy all such denunciations. My loyalty is to the true interests of the human race, and not to any Executive, or any rotten system which is still grinding out horrible caricatures of justice and reason. Were I in a minority of one, I should, if possible, attempt more strenuously to protest, and declaim the criminal absurdity of continuing to act in direct opposition to the two essential forces of justice and reason. I only wish it were possible for me to rouse the democracies to absolutely veto the use of this antiquated machine, and produce a deadlock only removable by new and rational methods.

It is no satisfactory reply that 'the whole spirit of the diplomatic service has changed, and become so enlightened that such bungling cannot occur again.' It would be indeed strange if the progress of the last hundred years in the democracies had not dragged the classes some distance from their former base ; but the question is so vital that I am not taking any risks, and we shall see that the evidence of duplicity in 1914, before the war, provides no guarantee for saintliness after the war.

The history of the Vienna Congress shows that a noble prologue may be followed by a disgusting tragedy. The rhetorical flourishes made in 1814 can scarcely be exceeded by prophecies of 1914, and the subsequent performance in 1814 reminds us that there still exists the same danger of catastrophe, and that there is still, unfortunately, too much truth in the old quotation :

> 'When the devil was sick the devil a saint would be.
> But when the devil was well, the devil a saint was he.'

Let us just notice the similarity of the chart, bearings and course to be steered in the voyage of humanity which was lured to utter destruction by the wreckers, and the present position ; and honestly accept the warning against false signals, scuttling or piracy.

At the close of the Napoleonic wars, the 'whole map of Europe was in the melting-pot' ; 'the map of Europe would be entirely re-drawn' ; 'justice and the desires of the nationalities would alone determine the new boundaries' ; and 'with the rightings of past wrongs, all causes of future discord would be abolished.'

Therefore when these identical promises are uttered in the near future, the wisest course is for the democracies to notify, in a decided tone, that they have heard all that before ; that they do not quarrel with the programme ; but that if the performance upon the present occasion does not honestly 'fill the bill,' they—as the people who have had to pay for the show, and suffer all the crowding—are going to take a hand themselves, and the artists are likely to require a 'permanent disablement pension' when the interview is over.

The preliminaries to the Vienna Congress were full of promise, as the following quotation shows :—

'The phrases which heralded the approaching Congress were curiously and disquietingly similar to those on the lips of our public men and journalists to-day when they speak of the "settlement" before us. "The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World," which had become a remote dream when Tennyson first coined

the expression in 1842, seemed in 1814 on the eve of accomplishment. The work of the Congress was to be no less than "the reconstruction of the moral order," "the regeneration of the political system of Europe," the establishment of "an enduring peace founded on a just redistribution of political forces," the institution of an effective and a permanent international tribunal, the encouragement of the growth of representative institutions, and, last but not least, an arrangement between the Powers for a gradual and systematic disarmament. "It seemed," writes Sir A. Ward, "as if the States composing the European family, free once more to take counsel together on terms of independence, were also free to determine their own destinies." The Congress of Vienna was to inaugurate a New Era. Such of these views, however, as pointed in a democratic or nationalistic direction represented the expectations of the peoples, not the intentions of the crowned heads and diplomatists who met at the Austrian capital. Among the members of the Congress the only man who at first voiced these aspirations of the world at large was the Russian Tsar, Alexander I., and such concessions to popular opinion as were made were due to what the English plenipotentiary, Lord Castlereagh, described as the "sublime mysticism and nonsense" of the Emperor.

'Instead, therefore, of establishing a new era, the Congress did its utmost to restore the old one. Everything which had happened in Europe since the outbreak of the French Revolution was regarded as a bad dream, the principles of popular freedom and national liberty were completely ignored, and an attempt was made to rivet again on the limbs of Europe the shackles of the antiquated frontiers which had been struck off by the hammer of Napoleon. Everywhere the national idea was trampled upon. Germany and Italy were put back again into the eighteenth century, Austria's territory in the latter country being largely increased; Norway was unwillingly yoked with Sweden, and Belgium with Holland; Switzerland was made to surrender her

democratic constitution and return to the aristocratic cantonal system of the past; and, lastly, Poland remained dismembered.

'The Allies, while fighting Napoleon, had issued the following proclamation to the world, couched in language almost identical with that used by the Allies who are now fighting Germany: "Nations will henceforth respect their mutual independence; no political edifices shall henceforth be erected on the ruins of formerly independent States; the object of the war, and of the peace, is to secure the rights, the freedom, and the independence of all nations." The Congress of Vienna failed to redeem these pledges: firstly, because its members had not grasped the principle of nationality, and used "nation" and "State" as if they were synonymous terms; secondly, because they did not represent the peoples whose destinies they took it upon them to determine, and made no attempt whatever to consult the views of the various masses of the population which they parcelled out among themselves like so much butter.'*

Now, taking the promise and performance of 1814; the verdict of the recent Commission upon the stationary progress of the diplomatic service and methods; the fact that it has taken one hundred years of insane squabbling, despicable duplicity and passion, the abortion of all desirable progress in sacrifice to the development of scientific wholesale murder; the innumerable carnivals of bloody wars; constant reshuffling of alliances and *ententes*, in the hope of dodging bankruptcies of money and blood by juggling the respective weights of the unhappy gladiators awaiting their summons to suicidal combat in terror of the fatal signal of 'thumbs down'; and considering the fact that even if a repeat performance may have more modern accessories, the calamity may be even more disastrous, I maintain that no honest man has any right to refrain from doing his utmost NOW to prevent the old machine from being again brought into action. No amount of

* *The War and Democracy*, pp. 32-33.

polishing or oiling is any excuse. And anybody who flatters himself that the converted respective managements have gone out of the butter business is too simple to have any right to be out of his nursery.

We want an entirely new machine, which will be incapable of turning out the old production. It was a poisonous article, produced by an antiquated machine working upon 'material unfit for human consumption.' Remember, the new prospectus is merely a reprint (with a few flourishes to give it an air of 'the latest and most startling novelty'), and above all, never for one moment forget that our fathers and grandfathers suffered crushing burdens throughout their lives, and that we ourselves have struggled against them until this horrible panic involved the whole of Europe in disastrous bankruptcy; and that the embitterment of the lives of our parents, the cramping limitations of our own lives, and the handicapping of the future lives of our children are all and each due to the audacious, and still legally possible, swindling of the 1814 Board of European Directors.

Let all the democracies insist upon the most efficient public inspection of every single detail regarding the raw material, the machinery, the staff, the process of manufacture, and even then demand that the goods shall not be taken out of the factory until they have been conscientiously examined by the prospective consumers, and received their official hall-mark of approval.

That the greatest danger still threatens the democracies is proved by this ghastly war, the latest and culminating product of the international diplomatic factory.

A few sidelights upon the last process in the malevolent activities of this machine may impress this fact more clearly; so I shall give a few selections from utterances and descriptions given by some of the workers themselves, as they tended the diplomatic machine during its last few days of disastrous working.

But it is essential, before doing so, to point out

definitely that this war is not in any true sense due to sudden developments. The Vienna Congress must bear the blame for starting the bungling which has led to the disaster.

To them was given the glorious task of utilising to the best advantage the recently freed forces of national sentiment. Each nation possessed its own energising stream and, had the Congress possessed any wisdom, these various supplies could have been properly grouped and directed in such a manner that each group would smoothly play its own part in driving the great European machine along the path of progress. But these men at the Congress had no talent, nor desire to bring order out of the various forces. They stupidly bunched the forces according to selfish whims and ancient dynasties, clapping down restraining lids to stifle the various groups and dumping some emperor or king to sit upon, and weight, these cupolas.

An accident was perfectly certain to happen some day. Various lids, at various times, have been blown partially off.

Scalding steam has escaped during the periodical limited wars; the peoples in the vicinity have been shockingly damaged, but, so far, each dumping-weight monarch has been able to climb back to his perch, sometimes more or less damaged. The uncertainty of when the gathering suppressed steam will finally burst out, and which, or how many, of these make-weights will have any lid left to sit on, has caused perpetual strain to the various diplomatic services. The responsible head of each service has passed an anxious existence, and provided an exact copy of an amateur juggler balancing a bomb upon his head, walking warily and anxiously watching each other juggler, furtively changing his bomb for a bigger and more deadly one as he caught others doing the same, or got an attack of nervous jumps. Fancy it never striking these amazing intellects that it was merely idiotic to run any competition in jugglery balancing with bombs, as the slightest accident must be fatal to somebody, and all

this anxiety could be prevented by simply having enough brains to choose a competition in the balancing of baskets of peoples' food, or bundles of social improvements. The malignantly idiotic bomb competition was bound to bring disaster sooner or later. After many threatening staggers, with more or less recovery of balance, the Sarajevo murders completely upset the Austrian diplomatic acrobat, and he dropped his bomb just as near to Serbia as he could manage. It is fair to remark that the actual dropping was partly due to a surreptitious kick administered at a critical and well-chosen moment by the German bomb-juggler. Of course all the others wobbled more than ever. Russia's performer could not keep his equilibrium. Germany and France began to stagger, and finally Britain joined in the contortions, with the inevitable result that all the bombs clattered down, and in the stampede the suppressing lids have all blown off, and the Fates—and some amateur politicians—only know how many lids and how many occupants will come together again finally.

It is necessary to keep in mind the facts of the original bungling which rendered eventual explosion a mathematical certainty by attempting to suppress the irresistible forces of the progress of democracies by means of geographical lids, each bearing a more or less alien sovereign as a make-weight. It is also essential to recognise that this proceeding was equal in wisdom, and as foredoomed as to consequences, as if the Vienna Congress had decided upon and carried out the plugging of the crater of Vesuvius. The gyrations and contortions of the various monarchies and diplomatic services during the intervening one hundred years will then acquire a more correct perspective, and we shall recognise that allowances must be made for the unfortunate position of these men. Justice and reason have been so far considered not class enough to obtain fair hearing at subsequent meetings (where they might have advised that the only method of avoiding explosion was to confess failure honestly, undo the original atrocious bungling, and start all over again

according to rational methods), so these unfortunate men, being devoid of the moral courage necessary for confessing failure, were compelled, by petty jealousies and regard for ancient customs, to attempt the impossible task of frustrating the immutable laws of nature.

The popular opinions founded upon the various coloured papers regarding the crisis are erroneous, as they place the whole blame upon the last few angry gibes between the cliques, totally oblivious of the long period during which pent-up forces have been accumulating until something simply had to give way, and allow the suppressed forces to explode. To change the metaphor, these people have watched the breaking of the shell and the hatching of the chick, but they have failed—and it is to the interest of the official cliques that they should continue to fail—to reflect upon the much longer period of incubation which preceded, and which was really responsible for the eventual fracture of the protecting shell.

The foul murders of the Austrian Prince and Princess; the complaints against the Serbian Government; the haggling over mobilisations, and even the question of Belgian neutrality, are all, and each, merely final excuses, as pertinent—and no more so—as those offered by struggling rioters when each tries to explain the justice of his own particular cause to the magistrate who requires an explanation of his participation in a concerted hooligan raid. Each one will excuse himself by emphasising some probably trivial incident—as a shout of 'yah!' or a mock imitation which offended his dignity, but not one of the culprits will mention that it was only the open culmination to years of squabbling, interspersed with surreptitious assaults, and anonymous window-breaking; and through it all rings the plaintive whine of 'Please, sir, it wasn't me!'

Still their feeble and often amusing accounts of even these trivialities, which only precipitated the conflict, are vastly enlightening as to their individual characters, and their educational and moral status. It is exactly so far, and no farther, that the various governmental

papers regarding the failure of negotiations leading to the war claim careful attention. In these we get a first-hand account, almost autobiographical, of the men in whose hands the peoples of Europe have left their destinies ; and of the irrational diplomatic social atmosphere, and the code of conduct engendered by a system cultivated in secret and totally irrational.

Every political student should obtain these various papers (the whole of which can be obtained for under 2s.), and read them through.

It is an occupation which calls to mind the Scotsman's remark, after his first struggle with a dictionary —namely, that 'the tales were verra interestin', but ra-rather too short.' Still, read with the purpose I have indicated, they provide most interesting material.

I shall only be able to give a few examples under the various heads, but these could be multiplied almost indefinitely except for space and weariness.

Please remember that it is the whole diplomatic system which is mostly to blame, just as it is really the neglected educational and social systems in the case of the previously mentioned hooligans. Most, if not all, of the men concerned in the following quotations were the victims of the pernicious system itself, and as I prefer to be regarded as 'impartial even if severely critical,' rather than as 'loyal' (which means examining the other fellow in the limelight with a magnifying glass, and then looking for your own faults with a patch over each eye and in the dark), there will be faults found at home, as well as abroad. The fact is that diplomacy so fetters one's feet that it is impossible to walk in a straight line, and a diplomatist is forced to advance towards any goal in a subtle and zigzag path—like a cat.

The atrocious murders at Sarajevo on 28th June 1914 are widely accepted as the *fons et origo mali*. This is definitely stated, and widely believed. But it is not true. A South African paper (*Leader*) published, in July 1914, a facsimile of the Austrian Order calling reservists in South Africa to the colours. It was

printed at the State works in Vienna, and had been sent out a month previously, thus anticipating the murders. The German cruiser, *Eber*, was in dock at Capetown just before the war, and got away just in time. A letter from Berlin to its commander was intercepted. This was dated 14th June 1914, A FORTNIGHT BEFORE THE MURDERS, and it revealed a complete scheme for coaling German war vessels after the outbreak of war, through secret agents in Capetown, New York and Chicago.*

In August, 1913, Austria approached Italy 'in common accord with Germany,' asking Italy's concurrence in an ultimatum to Serbia, similar to the one presented in 1914. Apologists state that the former one was based upon a question of religion, but at any rate it is proof of Austria and Germany working together to provoke war against the Balkan States. The Italian minister refused upon the ground that Italy was not concerned, as it would be an aggressive war and not defensive as stated in the agreement. The secrecy of diplomacy hushed this up, and the Italian nation, whose destinies were concerned, learnt nothing about the matter until after the outbreak of the present war!

The sharp practices (*alias* shrewdness) of diplomacy rendered it necessary, therefore, that Italy should be committed—if possible—in 1914, without her knowledge; so the Austrian (*cum* German?) manœuvres were hidden from her representatives.

'So little had the Russian Ambassador been made aware of what was preparing that he actually left Vienna on a fortnight's leave of absence about July 20th. He had only been absent a few days when events compelled him to return. It might have been supposed that Duke Avarna, Ambassador of the allied Italian Kingdom, which was bound to be so closely affected by fresh complications in the Balkans, would have been taken fully into the confidence of Count Berchtold during the critical time. In point of fact his Excellency was left completely in the dark. As for myself, no indication was given me by Count Berchtold of the

* Reported in *The Times*.

impending storm, and it was from a private source that I received on the 15th July the forecast of what was about to happen which I telegraphed to you the following day.' [1]

This secrecy has always been the trump card of unprincipled statesmen.

Mr Austin Harrison, writing in *The Sunday Chronicle* (3/1/15), justly remarks :—'The Crimean War was the work of Lord Stafford de Redcliffe. Bismarck's falsification of the Ems telegram resulted in the war of 1870. Russia went to war with Japan because of the Court's capital investments in forestry, etc., in Manchuria. And we fought the Boers because our capitalists wanted cheaper labour.'

'Diplomatic shrewdness' also 'cooked the accounts' in various ways, such as taking the mean advantage of absence of some important negotiator, suppressing telegrams, delaying despatches, etc.

'After this somewhat painful interview I returned to the Embassy, and drew up a telegraphic report of what had passed. This telegram was handed in at the Central Telegraph Office a little before 9 P.M. It was accepted by that office, but apparently never despatched.' [2]

(It never reached the Foreign Office.)

'President of French Republic and President of the Council cannot reach France, on their return from Russia, for four or five days, and it looks as though Austria purposely chose this moment to present their ultimatum.' [3]

'The Russian Government, to whom the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador at St Petersburgh had communicated the text of the note seventeen hours after its presentation at Belgrade, having taken note of the demands contained therein. . . .' [4]

Quotations are from the Papers of Austria, Belgium, England, France, Germany, Russia and Turkey (English official publication). References will be made to each by initial letter only, and number of exhibit.

[1] E. 161. [2] E. 160. [3] E. 6. [4] R. 77.

(Seventeen hours meanly sneaked out of a ridiculous forty-eight !)

'The Wolff Bureau has not published the text of the Serbian reply, although it was communicated to them. Up to the present (July 15) this note has not appeared in extenso in any of the local papers, which, to all appearances do not wish to publish it in their columns, being well aware of the calming effect which it would have on German readers.' [5]

'Paris, July 14 (27), 1914. It is clear from your telegrams of the 13 (26) July that you were not then aware of the reply of the Servian Government. The telegram from Belgrade informing me of it also took twenty hours to reach us. The telegram from the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, sent the day before yesterday at eleven o'clock in the morning, at the special urgent rate, which contained instructions to support our representations, only reached its destination at 6 o'clock. There is no doubt that this telegram was intentionally delayed by the Austrian telegraph office.' [6]

'Belgrade, July 12 (25), 1914.' (Delayed in transmission, received July 14 (27), 1914.) 'Following is the reply which the President of the Servian Cabinet to-day handed to the Austro-Hungarian Minister at Belgrade before the expiration of the time limit of the ultimatum.' [7]

'Paris, July 24, 1914. . . . M. Berthelot, on my instructions, confined himself to pointing out to the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador the feeling of anxiety which had been aroused by the information available this morning as to the contents of the Austrian note, and the painful feeling which could not fail to be aroused in French public opinion by the time chosen for so categorical a *démarche* with so short a time limit : that is to say, a time when the President of the Republic and the President of the Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic had left St Petersburgh and were at sea, and consequently were not able to exert, in agreement with those Powers which were not directly

[5] R. 46. [6] R. 36. [7] R. 13.

interested, that soothing influence on Servia and Austria which was so desirable in the interest of general peace.' [8]

'Vienna, July 25, 1914. The Russian Charge d'Affaires received instructions from his Government to ask for an extended time limit for the ultimatum to Servia at the very moment that Count Berchtold was leaving for Ischl, with the intention, according to the newspapers, of remaining there near the Emperor until the end of the crisis.' [9]

In regard to Germany's partnership in the Austrian ultimatum :

'Vienna, July 27, 1914. I have had conversations with all my colleagues representing the Great Powers. The impression left on my mind is that the Austro-Hungarian note was so drawn up as to make war inevitable; that the Austro-Hungarian Government are fully resolved to have war with Servia. . . .' [10]

'Foreign Office, July 25, 1914. The German Ambassador read me a telegram from the German Foreign Office saying that his Government had not known beforehand, and had had no more than other Powers to do with the stiff terms of the Austrian note to Servia.' [11]

'Berlin, July 25, 1914. Secretary of State confessed privately that he thought the note left much to be desired as a diplomatic document. He repeated very earnestly that, though he had been accused of knowing all about the contents of that note, he had in fact no such knowledge.' [12]

'Berlin, July 21, 1914. . . . The Secretary of State protested that he was in complete ignorance of the contents of that note, and expressed himself in the same way to me. I could not help showing my astonishment at a statement which agreed so little with what circumstances lead one to expect.' [13]

'Munich, July 23, 1914. In particular the President

[8] F. 25. [9] F. 45. [10] E. 41.
[11] E. 25. [12] E. 18. [13] F. 15.

of the Council said to me to-day that the Austrian note the contents of which were known to him was in his opinion drawn up in terms which could be accepted by Servia, but that none the less the existing situation appeared to him to be very serious.' [14]

'Berlin, July 24, 1914. It is not less striking to notice the pains with which Herr von Jagow, and all the officials placed under his orders, pretend to every one that they were ignorant of the scope of the note sent by Austria to Servia.' [15]

'Paris, July 25, 1914. Herr von Schoen told a certain number of journalists, and came to state at the Direction Politique, that there has been no "concert" between Austria and Germany in connection with the Austrian note, and that the German Government had no knowledge of this note when it was communicated to them at the same time as to the other Powers, though they had approved it subsequently.' [16]

'Berlin, July 25, 1914. Herr von Jagow not having made an appointment with him until late in the afternoon, that is to say, till the very moment when the ultimatum will expire, M. Broniewski sent an urgent note addressed to the Secretary of State in which he points out that the lateness of Austria's communication to the Powers made the effect of this communication illusory, inasmuch as it does not give the Powers time to consider the facts brought to their notice, before the expiration of the time limit. He insists very strongly on the necessity of extending the time limit, unless the intention be to create a crisis.' [17]

Against all this we must weigh the probability that Germany could only permit Austria to send an ultimatum without previously knowing the terms if she had assured Austria that she would support her in 'any . . . thing she pleased.' Also there is the fact of a previous dress rehearsal of a similar ultimatum in 1913, and so it might satisfy the anæmic diplomatic

[14] F. 21.
[15] F. 30.
[16] F. 36.
[17] F. 42.

conscience to state that they had not seen, or been consulted about the 1914 verbatim copy, but to conceal the fact that they had helped to write out, and put in some of the spicy bits into, the original 1913 copy.

How far duplicity is carried is further illustrated by the way in which each nation is befooled by the diplomatic secrecy which keeps it in ignorance not only of the malevolent activities preceding the war, but also hides the truth during hostilities from those whose husbands, fathers or brothers are courting death each day, paying the price of the preceding diplomatic prejudices, passions and mistakes. Further, this prevarication is sometimes carried into absolute and systematic lying. The peoples of Germany and Austria have been fed daily upon diplomatic and governmental lies; and a characteristic instance of the scientific cultivation of lying is given by the special correspondent of *The New York World*,* where, describing his experience of motoring between the advancing columns of the German army, he says: 'At one place I saw a huge army waggon containing a complete printing-press drawn up beside the road, and the morning edition of the *Deutsche Kreiger Zeitung* was being printed and distributed to the passing soldiery. Its news matter consisted mainly of accounts of German victories of which I had never heard, but which seemed to greatly cheer the soldiery.'

'Vienna, July 30, 1914. Although I am not able to verify it, I have private information that the German Ambassador knew the text of the Austrian ultimatum to Servia before it was despatched and telegraphed it to the German Emperor. I know from the German Ambassador himself that he endorses every line of it.' [18]

That the members themselves of these closed circles do not consider that the fact of their holding such powerful positions is due to original extraordinary merit, either personal, moral or intellectual, can be gathered

* "Fighting in Flanders," by F. A. Powell, p. 119.
[18] E. 95.

from the foregoing quotations, and also from a few more.*

'St Petersburgh, August 1, 1914. The policy of Austria had throughout been both tortuous and immoral, and she thought that she could treat Russia with defiance, secure in the support of her German ally. Similarly the policy of Germany had been an equivocal and double-faced policy, and it mattered little whether the German Government knew or did not know the terms of the Austrian ultimatum: what mattered was that her intervention with the Austrian Government had been postponed until the moment had passed when its influence would have been felt. Germany was unfortunate in her representatives in Vienna and St Petersburgh; the former was a violent Russophobe who had urged Austria on, and the latter had reported to his Government that Russia would never go to war.'[19]

'Vienna, July 30, 1914. Unfortunately the German Ambassador is himself so identified with extreme anti-Russian and anti-Servian feeling prevalent in Vienna that he is unlikely to plead the cause of peace with entire sincerity.'[20]

"I would add that the above message lost none of its acerbity by the manner of its delivery.'[21]

'Constantinople, September 20, 1914. I believe that Minister of War is the only firebrand.'[22]

'Constantinople, October 14, 1914. With the object of spreading the belief that Great Britain is the enemy of Islam, the German Embassy daily emits a stream of mendacity and calumny, which is circulated throughout the country by the Turkish newspapers, all of those

* Lord Daintree says, in *The Bad Times*:—'Men fight shy of you if you tell a certain kind of lie persistently, and if you cheat at cards. But I've been all my life lying. It was my profession to lie. I was a diplomatist, you know, Nobody thinks a bit the worse of me. In fact I've got a jewel case full of ribbons and stars and things given me as tokens of respect for my skill as a liar.'

[19] E. 139. [20] E. 95. [21] E. 160. [22] T. 83.

in the capital being in the pay of the German Embassy as the result of the large sums spent by it in corruption both in Constantinople and in the provinces.' [23]

That complications may ensue through important personages discreetly keeping out of the way :

'Berlin, July 25, 1914. Unfortunately it appeared from the press that Count Berchtold is at Ischl, and the Secretary of State thought that in these circumstances there would be delay and difficulty in getting time limit extended.' [24]

I wonder if this diplomat is capable of exclaiming : 'So sorry, really !' and still keeping his tongue in his cheek. (See reference 9, *ante.*)

The Kaiser was also out of bounds. With admirable thoughtlessness, he was enjoying a yachting cruise on the Norway coast. It looks like a pleasure trip similar to the tour made round our British centres a month earlier, by Dr Krupp von Bohlen. Of course anybody might, by inadvertence, choose a time for such a sight-seeing tour which might appear to outsiders as more or less unfortunate.

Yet inconvenience may result from an opposite course, as we find also that such persons will butt-in when they are not wanted.

'Berlin, July 26, 1914. Emperor returns suddenly to-night, and Under-Secretary of State says that Foreign Office regret this step, which was taken on His Majesty's own initiative. They fear that His Majesty's return may cause speculation and excitement.' [25]

Nothing so provoking has occurred since the heavy lead rushed on and took the limelight from the understudy.

But I am glad that this initiative was his Majesty's own. It looks as if he himself thought that he really ought to be at the emporium during such a rush of business. It is interesting to note that the Tsar's telegram to the Kaiser, despatched at 1 P.M., July 29, commences :—'I am glad that You are back in

[23] T. 128. [24] E. 18. [25] E. 33.

Germany.' This seems tardy congratulations, but it was only at a quarter to eleven on the night of the 28th that the Kaiser had telegraphed the Tsar, and I do not think it disrespectful just to wait until lunch-time to reply. It would make an interesting subject for a debating society :—'Which was the more complimentary, (*a*) the Tsar's telegram, or (*b*) the Foreign Office's regrets ? In plain numbers the Foreign Office has it, and there is a disquieting flavour of sarcasm about the telegram. But we must leave this as another of the unsolved problems of diplomacy.

When we come to consider which national diplomatic service was really responsible for the actual outbreak of the war, the firing of the European arsenal, the similarity to the magisterial inquiry into the blame for the ragamuffins' riot becomes startling. There is a united chorus of: 'Please, sir, it was 'im that begun it!'

The almost universal opinion here is that Germany is the chief bold bad villain, in league with a brother robber, Austria, and that they hatched and carried out the whole nefarious plot. As a contrast to this it pleases us to regard England (as representing ourselves) as the heroic knight clad in highly polished ironmongery who—having annexed the Holy Grail and other decorations—gallumphs on to the scene and rescues the pure and lovely maiden from the power of the aforesaid wicked men.

Considerable evidence has been offered that Russia is really to blame, and that she has been oiling and getting up steam on her Slavonic steam-roller. While Serbia is blamed also as an uncontrollable child, and of course France has nursed her spite and engineered the whole affair in order to regain Alsace and Lorraine.

Every one of these fairy tales contains a modicum of truth, but each one—taken as history—is false.

We ought to try to take an impersonal and national view of the whole field, and if we do this we shall recognise that it would be as ludicrous and unjust to dress England in a saintly robe and a halo as it would

be spiteful and unjust to decorate Germany with horns and a barbed tail.

Germany certainly merits the greatest blame, as the evidence proves that while the German people, as a nation, demand respect and are not responsible for the terrible evil, they allowed themselves to be befooled, ridden and lashed into uncontrolled passion by the hateful class of homicidal military lunatics which constitutes the Prussian caste.

These unprincipled ruffians, in league with armament profit-grubbers, have for many years swindled the rest of the German Empire. We shall see, when we come to consider false ideals, that the whole evil is due to the initial fault of not using the spirit-level of reason to see that we have placed our mental camera on a true level before we take our views of the various problems of life. International views are taken from an untrue level and with the camera so ignorantly adjusted that an atrociously distorted picture is made in each brain, in which no line, or perspective, is straight or true. One consequence is that this freak diplomacy gives the features, tact, shrewdness and skill, not only blurred as in social matters, but contorted into revolting caricatures.

We find that our irrational lens is hopelessly untrue, and that this error is one which is multiplied in proportion to the distance of the object photographed. Hence we find that in our mental pictures of home politics these three features—tact, shrewdness and skill—are not clean and sharply defined, but blurred and indefinite. But when we take our picture of foreign politics they are distorted into monstrosities, and the portrait of international diplomacy, translated into words, is: 'Cheat or be cheated; dodge or be dodged; to be most successful is to be able to do the worst tricks with the most winning smile and manners; but always remember—and prepare accordingly—that should you or the other man get tired of haggling, or be forced to sadly acknowledge that his line of tact, shrewdness and skill was going to knock yours off the road, the sensible

course of throwing off the artful dodger moralities and talking frankly and fairly is absolutely barred. Do not ask why. No rational man can tell you. Bow your head to decorated barbarism, and archaic traditions, and tell your mind to sleep. There is only one possible way out of this difficulty and that is that one of you must knock the other man down, and jump upon him, with nailed boots, and if you do not have the spikiest nails and get at him just a wee bit before time is called, well—it serves you right, and that is all there is to be said '—*verb. sap.*

I believe that to be a perfectly fair word-portrait of international diplomacy, taken with a language camera, through a lens optically correct, at proper focal distance, and in unclouded light.

That it is not unfair is proved by the extracts from the Official Papers, as well as by past history; and it is guaranteed by the undeniable fact that the heaviest and jaggedest boots have been the constantly growing ambition of each participant.

The outstanding feature of Germany has been that she clearly recognised the whole scheme—especially the inevitable boot section—and while the nation in the mass has, like ourselves and others, neglected its duty of auditing its national departments, the Prussian caste has for many years been nothing more nor less than spiked-boot monomaniacs. While other nations have suffered from a deplorable spiked-boot hobby, the Prussian has developed an all-engrossing spiked-boot obsession.

The questionable morality of the whole business has not even been considered; they had no mind to spare from the 'big boot and ever bigger boot' delusion. With the uncanny cunning displayed by monomaniacs they reduced the whole thing to a perverted science, and, with absence of all other morality, began insidious unsuspected education of the rest of the nation, combined with political juggling which gave them the power of stampeding the whole nation against their own desires, whenever they considered that any pernicious idea of

peace should threaten to recognise the delusion and call for its cure by a forcible dose of reason.

The French Yellow Book contains an interesting secret document dated 'Berlin, March 13, 1913, which provides several interesting sentences :

'Our new Army law is only an extension of the military education of the German nation. . . . We must allow the idea to sink into the minds of our people that our armaments are an answer to the armaments and policy of the French. We must accustom them to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity, in order to combat the provocations of our adversaries. We must act with prudence so as not to arouse suspicion, and to avoid the crisis which might injure our economic existence. We must so manage matters that under the heavy weight of powerful armaments, considerable sacrifices, and strained political relations, an outbreak should be considered as a relief, because after it would come decades of peace and prosperity, as after 1870. . . . We must not be anxious about the fate of our colonies. The final result in Europe will settle their position. On the other hand we must stir up trouble in the north of Africa and in Russia. It is a means of keeping the forces of the enemy engaged. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that we should open up relations, by means of well-chosen organisations, with influential people in Egypt, Tunis, Algeria, and Morocco, in order to prepare the measures which would be necessary in case of a European war. . . . Of course in case of war we should openly recognise these secret allies; and on the conclusion of peace we should secure to them the advantages they had gained. These aims are capable of realisation. The first attempt which was made some years ago opened up the desired relations. Unfortunately these relations were not sufficiently consolidated. Whether we like to or not it will be necessary to resort to preparations of this kind, in order to bring a campaign rapidly to a conclusion.

'Risings provoked in time of war by political agents need to be carefully prepared and by material means.

They must break out simultaneously with the destruction of the means of communication; they must have a controlling head to be found amongst the influential leaders, religious or political. The Egyptian School is particularly suited to this purpose; more and more it serves as a bond between the intellectuals of the Mohammedan World.

'However that may be, we must be strong in order to annihilate at one powerful swoop our enemies east and west. But in the next European war it will also be necessary that the small states should be forced to follow us or be subdued. In certain conditions their armies and their strong positions can be rapidly conquered or neutralised; this would probably be the case with Belgium and Holland, so as to prevent our enemy in the west from gaining territory which they could use as a base of operations against our flank. . . . If, on the contrary, their defensive organisation was established against us, thus giving definite advantages to our adversary in the west, we could in no circumstances offer Belgium a guarantee for the security of her neutrality. Accordingly, a vast field is open to our diplomacy to work in this country on the lines of our interests. . . .'[26]

I should like each reader to put this book down for a few moments and ruminate upon those two delightful phrases, 'our diplomacy to work' and 'the lines of our interests.' The character of the interests can be gauged from its likeness to the diplomacy at work!

Follow in your mind the unceasing burrowing in the sewers of spying, suborning of traitors, lying, bribery, sneakish undermining of a nation under the guise of friendship, so that when the stress comes you may find that they have grubbed so long within your sewers, cutting and enlarging them, that the ground gives way beneath your feet, and these foul-stained traitors may become your masters, although they are morally incapable of ever becoming your equals. Oh! This sort of diplomacy is of such a quality that after talking

[26] F. 3. Enclosure II.

about it one feels a longing to rinse one's mouth out with some disinfectant.

A curious sidelight upon how and why the nations should tear each other to pieces is found here :

"During the course of this conversation the Emperor moreover seemed overstrained and irritable. As William II. advances in years, family traditions, the reactionary tendencies of the Court, and especially the impatience of the soldiers obtain a greater empire over his mind. Perhaps he feels some slight jealousy of the popularity acquired by his son, who flatters the passions of the Pan-Germans, and who does not regard the position occupied by the Empire in the world as commensurate with its power. . . .

'For the rest, the Emperor William is less master of his impatience than is usually supposed. I have known him more than once to allow his real thoughts escape him. . . .'[27]

Just imagine a despicable, childish jealousy of some father, silly enough to be envious of his own son, having any weight in causing such inhuman atrocities and murders ! And none of us can be safe when jealousy can be aroused by a son and a cause which agree so perfectly when regarded from the view of intellectuality. Is there not some humour in the sad remark that 'I have known him more than once to allow his real thoughts escape him' !

Evidently a diplomat regards such an exception as a modern miracle. He can only explain that the patient is 'less master of himself.' This is really sad. As soon as such a man fails to be 'master of himself' the truth escapes ! There you are ! All this fine old diplomatic business likely to be ruined ! ONCE is bad enough ! but here is evidence of a RELAPSE ! Personally I regard it as the strongest recommendation of old age that I have ever heard, and if it is one of the things which arrive 'as William II. advances in years,' I should recommend that the legal age for monarchs be

[27] F. 6.

raised to sixty, and that all below this be regarded as a close time.

Besides utilising the more or less legitimate suggestion that France's grievance in regard to Alsace and Lorraine might accumulate force and cause a danger,[28] they estimated that excellent business might be done with a Russian bogey also.

'Berlin, March 15, 1914. Of course the Government points to the general situation in Europe and speaks of the "Slav Peril." As far as I can see, however, public opinion really seems indifferent to this "Peril" and yet it has accepted with a good grace, if not with welcome, the enormous burdens of these two successive laws.'[29]

There is evidence that this bogey was only diplomatic magnification of a probable concrete existence.

This leads us to the concurrent examination of Russia.

It was the Russian Minister, the late M. de Hartwig, who formed the Balkan League in Serbia, and encouraged the Serbians in tearing up the Treaty of Partition, guaranteed by the Tsar.

'According to the idea of the Russian statesmen a new Balcan union under Russian patronage should be called into existence, headed no longer against Turkey, now dislodged from the Balcan, but against the existence of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. It was the idea that Servia should cede to Bulgaria those parts of Macedonia which it had received during the last Balcan war, in exchange for Bosnia and Herzegovina which were to be taken from Austria. To oblige Bulgaria to fall in with this plan it was to be isolated, Roumania attached to Russia with the aid of French propaganda, and Servia promised Bosnia and Herzegovina.'[30]

It is no use Germanophobes saying this was nonsense.

In an article entitled 'Europe Under Arms' (June 3, 1914), the military correspondent of *The Times* explained how well founded were these German fears of

[28] See quotation in reference 26.
[29] F. 1. Enclosure I.
[30] G. Historical note.

Russian preparations. Russia, he explained, had raised her peace-effectives by 150,000 men, 'making a total peace strength of about 1,700,000, or approximately double that of Germany. . . .'

'The Russian reply to Germany is next door to a mobilisation in time of peace, and it quite accounts for the embittered outburst of the *Cologne Gazette*, and for the German pot calling the Russian kettle black. . . . There are signs that Russia has done with defensive strategy. . . . The increased number of guns in the Russian Army Corps, the growing efficiency of the Army, and the improvements made or planned in strategic railways are, again, matters which cannot be left out of account. These things are well calculated to make the Germans anxious.' [31]

Will Germanophobes please note that this appeared in *The Times* twenty-five days BEFORE the Sarajevo murders, and it would probably stretch even their prejudices against the German nation, or a writer of such an article, to insist that the effect was over three weeks ahead of its cause.

This, at any rate, proved the real lever which stampeded the German nation. When Russia mobilised, it became the supreme issue.

A German Socialist paper (*Volkstimme*) stated :

'All must set aside the aims and purposes of their party, and bear in mind one fact—Germany, and in a larger sense all Europe, is endangered by Russian despotism. At this moment we all feel the duty to fight chiefly and exclusively against Russian despotism. Germany's women and children must not become the prey of Russian bestiality ; the German country must not be the spoil of Cossacks ; because if the Allies be victorious, not an English governor or a French republican would rule over Germany, but the Russian Tsar. Therefore we must defend at this moment

[31] Quoted by Mr H. M. Brailsford in *The Origins of the Great War*, reprinted from the September *Contemporary Review*.

everything that means German culture and German liberty against a merciless and barbaric enemy.'

Just a few points for those who consider that they can dismiss this with a superior 'Pooh-pooh!' It proves that the German people had some grounds for anxiety about Russia; and that this danger was worse than any from either England or France. It is ridiculous for any man sitting in his arm-chair in England to say: The idea that Russia threatened Germany is untrue!' The evidence of one paper or one correspondent, like this quotation, is worth a thousand of these statements made by those of us who have not experienced the conditions there. It would be no more ridiculous for a South Sea Islander to maintain that Englishmen were silly to think that the invasion of Belgium by Germany was in any way a threat to their own comfort or safety. Nor have they the least right to discount it because of the German barbarities which only took place subsequently, until they have proved that *this* Socialist, and others, committed or approved of them.

It is a deplorable fact that the light with which the majority of people regard any question is always refracted by flaws in their mental lens through which it passes. The intellectual face of this lens, which receives the light, is very irregularly polished and the light is dissipated, while the national or focusing face of the lens has been left almost in its primitive state of roughness. The consequence is that the question examined is badly lighted with distorted rays, and the original beam of white light is split up into irregular-coloured patches. This accounts for the intellectual level of opinions shown in any people being mainly composed of rosy-coloured views of their own affairs, while the appropriation of the red rays for themselves necessitates a preponderance of the complementary green rays for their opponents. That this is a true but unrecognised statement of the case is proved by the saying, 'One man may steal the horse from the field, but

another may not look over the fence.' I have made this digression in the hope of demolishing any probable defence set up by those curious people who do not recognise their lamentable example of either ignorance or inherent injustice, as they insist that one Dreadnought laid down for the German navy must be a despotic threat to England, and with the next breath will deny that Germany had the slightest grounds for fear from any other nation, although on one side was France, with old injuries rankling and military preparations, advancing with more stringent army laws, and on the other frontier a giant nation of over one hundred and sixty millions, painfully roused by a wound inflicted by the Japanese 'Jack,' and assiduously developing his strength and means of destruction, with an—as yet—undeclared scheme of revenge.

Germany had quite as much ground for fear of Russia as had England for suspicion or fear of Germany.

Of course there are critics who will discount this evidence from *Volkstimme*, so I desire to provide them with an older and more respected stone wall against which they can run their heads, and one which was not erected by any 'new-fangled Socialism,' etc.

Sir Edward Creasy writes as follows :—

'What Russia has done since that time we know and we feel. And some of the wisest and best men of our own age and nation, who have watched with deepest care the annals and the destinies of humanity, have believed that the Sclavonic element in the population of Europe has as yet only partially developed its powers ; that, while other races of mankind (our own, the Germanic, included) have exhausted their creative energies, and completed their allotted achievements, the Sclavonic race has yet a great career to run ; and that the narrative of Sclavonic ascendancy is the remaining page that will conclude the history of the world.

'Let it not be supposed that in thus regarding the primary triumph of Russia over Sweden as a victory of the Sclavonian over the Germanic race, we are dealing with

matters of mere ethnological pedantry, or with themes of mere speculative curiosity. The fact that Russia is a Sclavonic empire, is a fact of immense practical influence at the present moment. Half the inhabitants of the Austrian empire, are Sclavonian. The population of the larger part of Turkey in Europe is of the same race. Silesia, Posen, and other parts of the Prussian dominions are principally Sclavonic. And during late years an enthusiastic zeal for blending all Sclavonians into one great united Sclavonic empire, has been growing up in these countries, which, however we may deride its principle, is not the less real and active, and of which Russia, as the head and champion of the Sclavonic race, knows well how to take her advantage.*

'Fear, not moderation, is the only effective check on the ambition of such powers as Ancient Rome and Modern Russia. The amount of that fear depends on the amount of timely vigilance and energy which other states choose to employ against the common enemy of their freedom and national independence.' †

The evidence of Russian threatening of Germany is corroborated by Serbia. In *The Times* of 18th September 1914, Mr C. M. Trevelyan wrote:

'Last year, when I was among them, they looked forward to this [a war with Austria] as the grand national object, and they regarded the then impending war with Bulgaria as an unfortunate but necessary prelude to the war of liberation against Austria. . . . The young men in Serbia, many of them, spoke of themselves as belonging to the "Piedmontese Party," and books about Piedmont's part in the Italian *risorgimento* were the commonest "serious literature" in the Belgrade shops, and lay on the table in the waiting-room of the Foreign Office.' ‡

* *The Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, by Sir Edward Creasy: Thirty-nine editions, ranging from 1851-1894. Quotations are from 1894 edition, p. 273.

† *Ibid.*, p. 282.

‡ See 31 *ante*.

Of course some may retort that this is rubbish, and they do not believe it ! Unless this criticism is based upon just as good or better evidence from one who HAS BEEN ON THE SPOT AND WRITES ABOUT PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE they might have saved their breath and escaped making themselves ridiculous ; and anybody who accepted their opinion, if home-made and not based upon first-hand evidence, would be as hopeless a politician as they are themselves.

For any true claim to reason and justice it is essential that we throw away every pair of patriotic spectacles, whether made in Germany or other of the countries involved ; and with this especial warning : not to forget to honestly remove the spectacles which long use makes us forget we are wearing, and which we may so far forget that we will actually deny that we have got them on, while all the time everybody else can see them straddling across our noses—and these are the 'British manufactured ; guaranteed,' etc., etc.

That Russia, when once Austria had started the trouble, meant to carry it through, is corroborated by her early and persistent efforts to entangle England with herself and France.

'St Petersburgh, July 24, 1914. He hoped that His Majesty's Government would not fail to proclaim their solidarity with Russia and France. . . . French Ambassador and Sazonof both continued to press me for a declaration of complete solidarity of His Majesty's Government with French and Russian Governments. . . .'[32]

Russia refused to allow the trouble to be confined to Austria and Serbia.

'St Petersburgh, July 24, 1914. Imperial Ambassador to German Chancellor :

'I have just utilized the contents of Order 592 in a prolonged interview with Sasonow. . . . The Secretary [Sasonow] indulged in unmeasured accusations toward Austria-Hungary and he was very much agitated. He declared most positively that Russia could not permit

[32] E. 6.

under any circumstances that the Servo-Austrian difficulty be settled alone between the parties concerned.'[33]

The German Ambassador in Paris urged moderation.

'Paris, July 24, 1914. . . . The German Ambassador particularly called my attention to the last two paragraphs of his note before reading it, pressing the point that this was the important matter. I noted down the text literally; it is as follows:—"The German Government consider that in the present case there is only question of a matter to be settled exclusively between Austria-Hungary and Servia, and that the Great Powers ought seriously to endeavour to restrict it to those two immediately concerned.

'"The German Government desire urgently the localisation of the dispute, because every interference of another Power would, owing to the natural play of alliances, be followed by incalculable consequences."'[34]

Of course anybody who says that 'there is no truth in that—it is German' is not fit to argue at all, unless he also admits equal force to the statement that 'that is, of course, false—it is English.'

It is important to note that Russian mobilisation began on 25th July, and this point is peculiarly interesting. In the French Yellow Book we find the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs saying:

'Paris, July 26, 1914. . . . From St Petersburgh we learn that M. Sazonof has advised Servia to ask for English mediation. At the Council of Ministers on the 25th, which was held in presence of the Emperor, the mobilisation of thirteen army corps intended eventually to operate against Austria was considered; this mobilisation, however, would only be made effective if Austria were to bring armed pressure to bear on Servia, and not till after notice had been given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon whom falls the duty of fixing the day, liberty being left to him to go on with negotiations even if Belgrade should be occupied. . . .'[35]

[33] G. 4. [34] F. 28. [35] F. 50.

Now, how do these 'only if necessary' and 'negotiations even should Belgrade be occupied' ideas fit in with the Tsar's telegram to the Kaiser on 30th July? (Please note the dates.)

'The Czar to His Majesty. Peterhof, July 30th 1914. 1.20 P.M.

'I thank You from my heart for Your quick reply. I am sending to-night Tatisheff [Russian honorary aide to the Kaiser] with instructions. The military measures now taking form were decided upon five days ago, and for the reason of defence against the preparations of Austria. I hope with all my heart that these measures will not influence in any manner Your position as mediator which I appraise very highly. We need Your strong pressure upon Austria so that an understanding can be arrived at with us.' [36]

On 27th July 1914 the correspondents of *The Times*, *Manchester Guardian* and *Daily Chronicle* agree that Germany is working for peace, and on the same day Russia again pressed England :

'St Petersburgh, July 27, 1914. . . . On the Minister for Foreign Affairs questioning me, I told him that I had correctly defined the attitude of His Majesty's Government in my conversation with him, which I reported in my telegram of the 24th instant. I added that you could not promise to do anything more, and that his Excellency was mistaken if he believed that the cause of peace could be promoted by our telling the German Government that they would have to deal with us as well as with Russia and France if they supported Austria by force of arms. Their attitude would merely be stiffened by such a menace. . . .' [37]

That Russia was not quite successful as a peace advocate :

'Foreign Office, July 31, 1914. I hope that the conversations which are now proceeding between Austria and Russia may lead to a satisfactory result. The stumbling-block hitherto has been Austrian mistrust of Servian assurances, and Russian mistrust of Austrian

[36] G. 23A. [37] E. 44.

intentions with regard to the independence and integrity of Servia.'[38]

'Berlin, July 31, 1914. According to information just received by the German Government from their Ambassador at St Petersburgh, the whole Russian army and fleet are being mobilised. Chancellor tells me that "Kriegsgefahr" will be proclaimed at once by the German Government, as it can only be against Germany that Russian general mobilisation is directed. . . . This news from St Petersburgh, added his Excellency, seemed to him to put an end to all hope of a peaceful solution of the crisis. Germany must certainly prepare for all emergencies.'[39]

Germany did, at least in some measure, try to limit damages:

'St Petersburgh, July 30, 1914. French Ambassador and I visited Minister for Foreign Affairs this morning. His Excellency said that German Ambassador had told him yesterday afternoon that German Government were willing to guarantee that Servian integrity would be respected by Austria.'[40]

The Kaiser said in his telegram to the Tsar, on 28th July 1914: 'On the other hand I by no means overlook the difficulty encountered by You and Your Government to stem the tide of public opinion. In view of the cordial friendship which has joined us both for a long time with firm ties, I shall use my entire influence to induce Austria-Hungary to obtain a frank and satisfactory understanding with Russia. I hope confidently that You will support me in my efforts to overcome all difficulties which may yet arise.'[41]

On 29th July 1914, Reuter's St Petersburg correspondent sent this message to the Press: 'Confident of England's support about which doubts have mostly disappeared, the Russian public is prepared for war.'

How did Russia get this idea? Flames were already arising on 28th July.

'Nish, July 28, 1914. . . . I have urged on the

[38] E. 111. [39] E. 112. [40] E. 97. [41] G. 20.

Servian Government the greatest moderation pending efforts being made towards a peaceful solution. Two Servian steamers fired on and damaged, and two Servian merchant-vessels have been captured by a Hungarian monitor at Orsova.' [42]

And it could not be due to any question about Belgian neutrality that Russia counted upon Britain's help, as the first mention of this does not appear until later.

'Berlin, July 29, 1914. As regards Holland, however, his Excellency said that so long as Germany's adversaries respected the integrity and neutrality of the Netherlands, Germany was ready to give His Majesty's Government an assurance that she would do likewise. It depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over, Belgian integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany.' [43]

As regards Austria, it is sufficient to refer readers to the bullying ultimatum, the ridiculous forty-eight-hour time limit; the mean stealing of vital portions of this time limit by dodging the Italian and Russian Ambassadors and delaying telegrams; and the transparent device of saying that Servia's reply was not satisfactory [44]; the tearing up of the Treaty of Berlin in 1909 by the stealing of Bosnia and Herzegovina; the too previous notices to the Austrian reservists in South Africa; the previous attempt to cajole Italy to join with herself and Germany in a Balkan raid in 1913; and the unfortunate (for fair play) absence of the Emperor and Minister during the time for possible negotiations.

It is difficult to find any evidence at all in Austria's favour. This leads me to remark that Austria seems to have escaped fair condemnation because we have been too busy venting our spite elsewhere.

As regards France. There is no doubt that she did not intend that any universal peace business should occur until she had wrested back her lost provinces. And she did not set about this business on any peace lines. The alliance with Russia was with this definite

[42] E. 65. [43] E. 85. [44] A. H. 34.

object. So also was the three years Army law; and especially—and here we come round to ourselves—the secret arrangements with England.

Before concluding this section with the treatment of British diplomatic actions, we must refer to other countries involved. It is almost sufficient to say, in regard to Turkey, that she fully maintained her unsavoury traditions.

The Turkish War Minister was the bounden tool of Germany.

'Constantinople, October 16, 1914. Minister of War, who is willing tool of Germans, is now supreme. Minister of the Interior was most influential Minister before mobilisation, but is so no longer.'[45]

The Grand Vizier was evidently straightforward, but powerless.

'Constantinople, August 27, 1914. He fully understood Germany's aims in the matter, and all Turkish Government were determined not to fall into the trap. Grand Vizier is, I am sure, absolutely sincere himself.'[46]

But Germany employed arguments which have always proved irresistible in the appeal to Turks:

'Sophia, October 16, 1914. Ninety-seven cases of bullion passed through Rustchuk yesterday for Constantinople, accompanied by six Germans. In the last three weeks many heavy cases and stores have passed through same town. Armaments are believed to be sent through in the night.'[47]

This explains the suicide of Turkey.

Italy for more than nine and a half months maintained her neutrality, but it was not a noble or disinterested neutrality. Her refusal to join Germany and Austria in a war which was not defensive but for the further pilfering of territory by Austria and the idiotic 'Weltmacht' of Germany, was a policy both of high principle and moral courage. But her undoubted intention to claim what she desires out of the settlement, while still giving no assistance, when this extra weight might have shortened the war and saved thousands of

[45] T. 134. [46] T. 42. [47] T. 131.

lives doomed through protracted wearing away processes, looks very like selfishness, and is a very good imitation of the fable of the monkey, the cat and the roasted chestnuts. Somebody aptly described Italy's attitude in the phrase that 'She was waiting, and anxious, to rush nobly to the assistance of the winner'!

The history of this failure of diplomatic negotiations between Italy and Austria-Hungary was published to the world in an Italian Green Book dated 'Session of the 20th May, 1915.'

It is an interesting and characteristic example of the system of diplomacy under which the world suffers economic panics and fratricidal wars, with all their insane destruction of historic treasures; the mad ruin of social developments and undertakings built up by the expenditure of years of thought and burdensome taxation; and the delirium of maniacal ravings of hatred and bloodshed.

Italy entered this war solely upon her quarrel with Austria-Hungary, who neither would, nor could—upon the instant—buy Italy's neutrality at the price at which she placed it upon the market.

There can be no pretence that she was actuated by any motive more noble than her own material interests. 'Defence of small nationalities' and the 'preservation of freedom from brutal aggressions' have absolutely nothing whatever to do with this case at any rate.

Of course the allied press have acclaimed her as a welcome—if late—champion of liberty; but Italy herself makes no such preposterous claim in her official publication.

She honestly, and bluntly, states the true nature of her claim in the opening sentences of the first document, dated Rome, 9th December 1914, when liberty and international honour had been struggling for their very existence during more than four months of the ghastliest war ever imagined.

'Rome, 9th December 1914. I request your Excellency to convey the following verbal communication to Count Berchtold.

'The present military advance of Austria-Hungary into Serbia constitutes a fact which cannot avoid becoming the subject of examination by the Italian and Austro-Hungarian Governments on the basis of the stipulations contained in Article VII. of the Triple Alliance. The same Article places the Austro-Hungarian Government, in the case of even temporary occupations, under the obligation of first coming to an agreement with Italy and also of granting compensation. The Imperial and Royal Government should therefore have consulted us and entered into agreement with us before causing its army to cross the Serbian frontier. . . . It should further be observed that the stipulation of the aforesaid Article VII. gives Italy the right to compensation also on the score of advantages other than territorial which the Austro-Hungarian Government might secure in the Balkan region.' [48]

The whole of the Italian Green Book consists of nothing except the constant haggling over this quaint 'compensation.'

It embodies the transference, by Austria-Hungary to Italy, of the Trentino, cities, islands, etc.; and it illustrates beautifully the fact that the last people to be consulted in such a matter are the people to whom these areas actively belong and whose whole existence and happiness constitute the only valuable product of the areas upon which they live.

Common justice would rule that if the inhabitants of these areas did not desire to live under Austrian rule—then Austria ought never to have possessed them or have any power to barter them like buttons or marbles.

The diplomatic system is so imbecile that Italy's formal claim confirms the former alternative, while abjectly recognising the latter.

It is unnecessary to make quotations until we come to Document 64, except just to show how even a mistake in translation, an oversight, or a simple misstatement in these diplomatic dispatches may introduce dangers of disasters.

[48] I. 1.

'Vienna, 16th March 1915. . . . To these considerations which rendered impossible the performance of the agreement immediately upon its being concluded, were further to be added the circumstance that the Imperial and Royal Government could certainly not decide during the war the fate of populations whose sons were not fighting for the integrity of the Monarchy.'[49]

The Minister for Foreign Affairs writes: 'Rome, 17 March, 1915. . . . Baron Burian has declared that "the Imperial and Royal Government certainly could decide during the war the fate of populations whose sons were now fighting for the integrity of the Monarchy."'[50]

Whatever may be the explanation of the omission of the most important word, NOT, from the quotation given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, it entirely reverses the original statement.

If this omission occurred in the original dispatch, it was scarcely likely to assist the friendly relations of the two disputants, or advance the interests of their respective nations.

But even if this danger did not exist, the demonstration of error in the published document proves to the democracies that when such errors are possible it is better that such vital contracts should be inspected, before confirmation, by a responsible and representative committee of those who will be bound by them. Oversights, errors, mis-statements ignorant or malignant, are easy and common to individuals, and even to restricted cliques; but they can hardly escape the examination, or survive the criticism of a fairly constituted body of representatives of the people.

Document 64 is especially interesting as it establishes the Italian position definitely and beyond dispute in all relationships, materially, as regards the Central Powers, the Allies and itself; and morally, as regards the motive principle of mere self-interest, or noble purpose of the defence of either weakness or right from the aggression of brute force or robbery.

[49] I. 45. [50] I. 47.

This document consists of a full and detailed inventory of all 'those rights, privileges, goods and chattels' claimed by the plaintiff, Italy, from the defendant, Austria-Hungary.

From 9th December 1914 to 8th April 1915, the various documents show a diplomatic haggling which would be amusing in any other line of business.

Diplomatic negotiations as to such adjustments of territories and spheres of influence always start with an amazing similarity to the position where one man claims possession of an estate and the holder replies by offering him a brick off the back-yard wall. Either the estate has to shrink, or the brick to multiply; according to the tact, shrewdness or skill of the negotiators.

In this case, after four months spent with respective insistence upon the right to the estate and protests as to the adequacy of the brick, the claimant finally agreed to render in writing his definite claim. Hence Document 64 of the Italian Green Book.

The only feature which distinguishes it from ordinary straightforward business transactions is the fact that it was only after a promise that it was without prejudice in case of failure, and would not limit any future claim to have all improvements included in the claim for the estate or, on the other side, preclude the substitution of an inferior—or even of an only imaginary—brick.

Each side had struggled to introduce a kind of auction basis and to induce the other to start the bidding.

Italy was far the more insistent for this, and we find eagerness in an earlier dispatch: 'Rome, 22nd March 1915. . . . Nevertheless I profess myself ready, as I have already announced, to Prince von Bulow and to Baron Macchio, seriously to examine any concrete proposal that the Imperial and Royal Government may place before us, and let me add that with intent to facilitate discussion I should also be disposed to consider as if never made, so far as future effects are concerned,

any proposal submitted that should not be accepted by us.' [51]

Again, Italy is importunate: 'Rome, 23rd March 1915. . . . I take note of the proposal of Baron Burian to open negotiations; but I continue in doubt regarding the possibility of arriving at an understanding until we are agreed upon the immediate performance of all that should be concerted, so that I cannot at present make any proposals or take the initiative. But I shall welcome and examine any proposal that Baron Burian may place before us, and with a view to facilitating matters I should consider any proposal not accepted by us as if never made and I should observe all secrecy with regard to such proposals and the respective negotiations.' [52]

Austria-Hungary reciprocates: 'Vienna, 24th March 1915. . . . He was also disposed, equally with your Excellency, to consider on his side as if never made, so far as future effects are concerned, any proposal submitted but not agreed upon by the two Governments.' [53]

After further sparring, we come at last to something definite, and find Italy putting forth a formal order thus: 'Rome, 8th April 1915.—To satisfy the wish expressed by Baron Burian I here formulate the conditions which the Royal Italian Government considers indispensable if a normal and enduring situation of reciprocal cordiality and of possible future co-operation towards common aims of general policy is to be created between the two States.' [54]

'Article I. Austria-Hungary cedes to Italy the Trentino with the frontiers which were those of the Italian Kingdom in 1811, that is to say, after the Treaty of Paris on the 29th February, 1810.' [55]

Various other 'goods' are specified, such as archipelagos, etc., and then we come to conditions:

'Article V. Italy should immediately occupy the ceded territories (Articles I., II., and IV.) whilst Trieste and its territory (Article III.) should be evacuated by

[51] I. 52. [52] I. 53. [53] I. 54.
[54] I. 64. [55] I. 64.

the Austro-Hungarian authorities and military forces, with the immediate discharge of all soldiers and sailors derived from one and the other.' [56]

I think that this was inconsiderate of Italy, as it peremptorily demanded of a sufferer (Austria-Hungary), who was torn by agonising struggles to avoid dissolution, that she must, even during her struggles for very life, voluntarily amputate one of her own limbs and thus, by her own act, further handicap her chance of escaping dissolution. Italy recognised this herself, and knew what it meant for Austria.

'Rome, 23rd March 1915. . . . On the other hand the maintaining under arms by the Empire of between 40,000 and 50,000 men belonging to territories whose cession to Italy had been decreed would give rise to a thousand daily incidents, to unheard-of difficulties and to a continual reaction of public opinion.' [57]

'Inconvenient' would be a mild term to apply to the addition of such a serious operation upon an almost moribund patient.

Still, that Italy was prompted by nothing more noble than her own interests is proved by :

'Article X. Italy undertakes to maintain perfect neutrality throughout all the present war with regard to Austria-Hungary and Germany.' [58]

Therefore, when upon 21st May 1915, Italy donned her armour and pranced into the arena against the Central Powers, the vociferous cheer from the Allies which greeted her denoted a welcome and valuable—if tardy—addition to their material forces, but none whatever to their moral purpose.

Whatever courses Roumania and Bulgaria may take when it may have been possible to worry through the more complicated processes of dodging and dovetailing the multiplicity of similar auction biddings, and to arrive at some preliminary workable contract, the result will be to increase the cost to one or the other side of the grouped speculators without adding either moral glory

[56] I. 64. [57] I. 53. [58] I. 64.

or philanthropy to whichever side may secure their co-operation.

Personally, I cannot blame either of these lesser operators, as they have a perfect right to consider whether they would not be wiser to remain outside the general rioting, as an onlooker may have just as good a chance of sharing in subsequent spoils, and without the trouble of acquiring black eyes or maiming.

Belgium is the only country concerning which it is impossible to bring any evidence even suggesting fault. She provides the world with a unique example demonstrating that throughout the whole crisis the only possible verdict has been: 'Through indescribable trials, the deeper her suffering, the greater her honour.'

Now about ourselves. It is impossible to accept the popular belief that we are merely 'noble champions of oppressed liberty.'

Even were this possible, we could only justly claim that this noble championship happened, and that we were otherwise forced by diplomatic entanglements, into a position in which the pure white limelight could pick us out. But we should have been in this war even without any question of Belgian neutrality. The emphasis laid upon this single question, and the studied ignorance of, or suppression of the other questions, whether by officials or public, is merely prevarication. That is putting it politely.

This pleasing pose is an excellent example of the lamentable sloppy thinking and neglect of reason which true education ought to eradicate.

A favourite quotation is: 'It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back.' Not only is this old adage untrue, but it is also vicious. It seduces thought from questioning the immorality of the whole business. It inculcates the false idea that the only mistake was not to have stopped just before that last straw, whereas the true method would have been to prosecute the owner for a long and cruel process of overloading the camel, with protracted and ever-increasing suffering, until agony was swallowed up in death. Practically

the entire guilt was accumulated previous to the addition of the last straw; and the withholding of this fractional surplus would only have prolonged the beast's misery, and delayed the merciful death which released it from its tyrannical owner.

The violation of Belgian neutrality was nothing more than this last straw; and the popular mental picture of Sir Edward Grey (as representing our diplomatic service) standing beside the accomplished tragedy, and pleading that this last straw was the sole culprit, and that he had not added this last instalment to the burden of the unfortunate camel, is a ludicrous travesty, and one which I am convinced the acknowledged honesty and high character of Sir Edward Grey would impel him to repudiate with scorn.

This lamentable experience must make him sadly realise that the killing load was made up of innumerable straws thrown on cruelly, thoughtlessly and criminally by diplomats, officials, and many non-authorised blunderers.

We must look fairly, and widely, throughout recent history to find the individuals who share the blame of adding to the load which this camel inherited from the Vienna Congress.

To mention a few, as finger-posts to further study: there was Lord Salisbury's naïve deal in regard to Heligoland; Mr Balfour's unsubstantiated but bitter speeches in July 1912—two heavy sheafs of straws. Lord Roberts in 1908 threw on quite a load in itself with his speech in the House of Lords about 80,000 German waiters being an 'army of occupation' already in possession; and again, in October 1912, at Manchester, his 'Germany strikes when Germany's hour has struck' may have been good melodrama, but it was a gratuitous addition to the dangerous load. Generous contributions have been diligently added by Lord Charles Beresford *et hoc genus*; while the heaps of dirty straw shoved on to the load by armament profiteers caused—as they were intended to cause—acute and distressing groans from the long-suffering beast.

Perhaps the greater portion of the fatal load was forced upon the too patient animal by the ceaseless endeavours of that hunting-pack (whose noisy excitement and restless activity would have gladdened the heart of John Peel), represented by that curious partnership the Master, who has been most aptly described as the man who 'reduced the price of a certain publication from threepence to one penny, and its value to one halfpenny,'* and his whipper-in, who foretold the war in a series of articles included at the latter figure.

It is of the greatest importance that we should recognise that amongst those of us who are unofficial, ordinary individuals, there are multitudes who are merely immature children in politics, and who, with brains covered with—and circumscribed by—newspaper-caps, and a wooden sword of blunted mental laziness, have gone about braying that 'one Englishman is better than three ——s, or any other foreigner,' and then pranced about in mock victorious battles.

Each one of us who has done this, or anything like it, has added his straw upon each occasion, and by so much does he share the blame for the prolonged cruelty and ultimate breakdown of the diplomatic camel.

Sir Edward Grey would be the first to admit that his arrangement with France as to military consultations and the pooling of the English and French navies were in themselves a load which would have been fatal to the camel during the inevitable strenuous commotion of hostilities between France and Germany, even had the final 'neutrality straw' never eventuated.

In fact he has already established this fact :

'Foreign Office, July 31, 1914. I said to the German Ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St Petersburgh and Paris, and go to the length of saying

* *New Statesman.*

that if Russia and France would not accept it, His Majesty's Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but, otherwise, I told the German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in.'[59]

Remember most carefully that I am uttering no trace of accusation against Sir Edward Grey and our Government. We all admire the way in which they grappled with a crisis beyond precedent and far outside the experience of any other Government in history. Even opponents of usually active hostility admit their wonderful accomplishments.

The decisiveness and incisiveness of their politics have been of at least equal value to our Empire as the skill of our generals and the sterling courage of our soldiers, whether home or colonial.

The same grit was inherent BEFORE the disaster, but circumstances were too powerful to be combated.

It is all the pernicious diplomatic system.

The more we exonerate our Ministers, the more we convict the system; and no fair-minded man will deny equal excuses for the various representatives of all the other nations. But it is necessary to produce evidence of the fatal coils which crush both the just and the unjust, and we shall do this in regard to our own Ministers.

The quotation just given (59) is from Sir Edward Grey himself, and reports his discussion with the German Ambassador. In the whole dispatch there is not one mention of Belgium. Neutrality of any country is not alluded to, YET Sir Edward Grey definitely states: 'I told the German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in.'

Again, it was only AFTER this declaration that England and France were bound together to stay out or come in, that Sir Edward Grey FIRST STARTED HIS INQUIRIES ABOUT BELGIAN NEUTRALITY AT ALL!

[59] E. 111. It is interesting to note that this dispatch is erroneously dated '1913' in both the White Paper and the official reprint at one penny; but it is correct in the index, and corrected in the reprint by *The New York Times*.

'Foreign Office, July 31, 1914. In view of existing treaties, you should inform Minister for Foreign Affairs that, in consideration of the possibility of a European war, I have asked French and German Governments whether each is prepared to respect the neutrality of Belgium provided it is violated by no other Power. You should say that I assume that the Belgian Government will maintain to the utmost of their power their neutrality, which I desire and expect other Powers to uphold and observe. You should inform the Belgian Government that an early reply is desired.' [60]

Any man who knew the above facts, and also any reader of this book who in future maintains that the neutrality of Belgium had any weight in bringing us into the European war, simply convicts himself of untruth.

I am as glad as anybody that this additional cause was added to those for which we fight; not from any disregard of the suffering of Belgium, to which country I have already paid my tribute; but even had this crime not been added to Germany's list of degradations, we know from Sir Edward Grey's own mouth that we should have been drawn in. This might have been a duty to fulfil a secret understanding; but when the unnecessary weight and super-added moral call of the Belgian violation occurred, this duty was gladdened with the ambition for righteous revenge upon these inhuman monsters. I consider it a matter of such importance that we should obtain a fair and full knowledge of our own position that I shall give a few additional quotations concerning it. We shall recognise that the popular idea is mistaken; that the absurd methods of diplomacy have resulted in international relationships and their records presenting a hopeless tangle which would bankrupt any business firm in the world were it applied to their offices; that the most conscientious workers in these departments are so tied up by the original archaic system and the accumulated abuses, that it is impossible for them to make any two columns balance.

[60] E. 115.

As auditors we shall find that it is a long-continued exercise of rotten business methods which have caused the bankruptcy; that the smash was bound to come sooner or later, and that no one cause can be said to have been responsible, although one or two are mainly to blame; and that the petition in bankruptcy was filed BEFORE presentation of the claim of Belgium, which only became due in the interval between filing the petition and the adjudication.

Now to point out the amazing muddle of international accounts.

Sir Edward Grey made a declaration, on 3rd August 1908, that England would never go to war over a Balkan question. This position he still held at the beginning of the crisis.

'Foreign Office, July 24, 1914. I added that I felt great apprehension, and that I should concern myself with the matter simply and solely from the point of view of the peace of Europe. The merits of the dispute between Austria and Servia were not the concern of His Majesty's Government, and such comments as I had made above were not made in order to discuss those merits.' [61]

This attitude was also maintained by our ambassadors abroad:

'St Petersburgh, July 24, 1914. I said that I would telegraph a full report to you of what their Excellencies had just said to me. I could not, of course, speak in the name of His Majesty's Government, but personally I saw no reason to expect any declaration of solidarity from His Majesty's Government that would entail an unconditional engagement on their part to support Russia and France by force of arms. Direct British interests in Servia were nil, and a war on behalf of that country would never be sanctioned by British public opinion.' [62]

'Foreign Office, July 25, 1914. I do not consider that public opinion here would or ought to sanction our going to war over a Servian quarrel. If, however,

[61] E. 5. [62] E. 6.

war does take place, the development of other issues may draw us into it, and I am therefore anxious to prevent it.' [63]

'Foreign Office, July 29, 1914.—In the present case the dispute between Austria and Servia was not one in which we felt called to take a hand. Even if the question became one between Austria and Russia we should not feel called upon to take a hand in it. It would then be a question of the supremacy of Teuton or Slav—a struggle for supremacy in the Balkans; and our idea had always been to avoid being drawn into a war over a Balkan question. If Germany became involved and France became involved, we had not made up our minds what we should do; it was a case that we should have to consider. France would then have been drawn into a quarrel which was not hers, but in which owing to her alliance, her honour and interest obliged her to engage. We were free from engagements, and we should have to decide what British interests required us to do.' [64]

Things seem to get mixed up, and this absurd balance of power business showed that the combined wisdom of all the European diplomatic services could not invent a more stable protection for sanity and peace than a 'house made with cards,' and with the mutual understanding that any one national service could at any time either surreptitiously or brazenly withdraw its respective cards, with the only result that anybody ever expected since cards were first invented.

In this extract Sir Edward Grey states that 'France would then have been drawn into a quarrel which was not hers.' We might call that 'Benefit Number 1.' Then comes the statement: 'We were free from engagements, and we should have to decide what British interests required us to do.' Yet two days later (31st July, see ref. E. 111), Sir Edward Grey states that that morning he had 'told the German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in.' Therefore, France was to be 'drawn into a quarrel which

[63] E. 24. [64] E. 87.

was not hers,' and 'if France became involved we should be drawn in'! [65]

It is unnecessary to offer any prize for anybody who could invent a more idiotic scheme of international diplomacy. It is an impossibility, and it would only be cruel to possible contestants to allure them into straining themselves to produce improvements while perfection has been already in use with such disastrous results. It would be a pity not to notice one or two more of these quaint—but only possible—muddles.

'Foreign Office, July 31, 1914. Nobody here feels that in this dispute, so far as it has yet gone, British treaties or obligations are involved. Feeling is quite different from what it was during the Morocco question. That crisis involved a dispute directly involving France, whereas in this case France is being drawn into a dispute which is not hers.' [66]

No two pieces of this jig-saw puzzle fit decently. Here is the piece which ought to tally with the last quotation. It is of the same date:

'Foreign Office, July 31, 1914. I said it was quite wrong to suppose that we had left Germany under the impression that we would not intervene. I had refused overtures to promise that we should remain neutral. I had not only definitely declined to say that we would remain neutral, I had even gone so far this morning as to say to the German Ambassador that, if France and Germany became involved in war, we should be drawn into it. That, of course, is not the same thing as taking an engagement to France, and I told M. Cambon of it only to show that we had not left Germany under the impression that we would stand aside.' [67]

Can we wonder at the deplorable confusion of diplomacy? We tell one prospective pugilist that if he and the other fellow begin to fight we shall take a hand on the other man's side. We inform this other man that this has no resemblance to taking an engagement on his side; but that all the same, we have distinctly

[65] E. 111. [66] E. 116. [67] E. 119.

impressed upon the other fellow what he may expect, engagement or no engagement!

Now that is all fixed up, both of these men know exactly where WE are, so we proceed to qualify it, and talk round it until we really do not ourselves know either where we are, or even where we recently said that we were. In the same dispatch we find that the French Ambassador is told: Up to the present moment, we did not feel, and public opinion did not feel, that any treaties or obligations of this country were involved. Yet that very morning the other man had gone away with the information that as soon as he hit his opponent we should be drawn in! However, as this other fellow knew this definitely, and had gone off to inform his backers, we proceed to discuss various possible points which might arise! 'The preservation of the neutrality of Belgium might be, I would not say a decisive, but an important factor, in determining our attitude.' How many times is it necessary to really determine our attitude? The other man was told that 'if France is involved, we should be drawn in.' Now to any outsider—like myself and this man who obtained the information directly—this ought to save all trouble involved in looking round for any more decisive factors. The man upon whose side we have so frequently been drawn in remarks, before the interview is over, that 'It could not be to England's interest that France should be crushed by Germany.' Whatever did he think we had founded our ultimatum to the other man upon? Certainly not upon the subsequent discussion about the neutrality of Belgium, which could be called an important but not decisive factor.

Arguing with diplomats is like the two of you wrestling upon a quicksand. After every shove you find that neither of you is in anything like the same position as before, and even while you are engaged in a struggle, your feet shift all over the place, and neither you nor the other man can calculate whether the course your feet will take will be north, south, east or west. You can only wait until this particular struggle is over,

rapidly calculate where they have slid to, and then announce that this is the position you have all along maintained, although in truth everybody else is rather less surprised to find you just there than you are yourself to note where you have come to anchor. The curious conditions governing these contests are well illustrated by another dispatch :

'Foreign Office, August 1, 1914. I told the German Ambassador to-day that the reply of the German Government with regard to the neutrality of Belgium was a matter of very great regret, because the neutrality of Belgium affected feeling in this country. If Germany could see her way to give the same assurance as that which had been given by France it would materially contribute to relieve anxiety and tension here. On the other hand if there were a violation of the neutrality of Belgium by one combatant while the other respected it, it would be extremely difficult to restrain public feeling in this country. . . . He asked me whether, if Germany gave a promise not to violate Belgian neutrality we would engage to remain neutral.

'I replied that I could not say that; our hands were still free, and we were considering what our attitude should be. All I could say was that our attitude would be determined largely by public opinion here; and that the neutrality of Belgium would appeal very strongly to public opinion here. I did not think that we could give a promise of neutrality on that condition alone.

'The Ambassador pressed me as to whether I could not formulate conditions on which we would remain neutral. He even suggested that the integrity of France and her colonies might be guaranteed.

'I said that I felt obliged to refuse definitely any promise to remain neutral on similar terms, and I could only say that we must keep our hands free.' [68]

I have quoted this dispatch in full, except one sentence, which only mentions a meeting of the Cabinet. I have done this as it seems to embody the diplomatic

[68] E. 123.

limitations. Looked at fairly, it is exactly as if two wrestlers, stripped for a catch-as-catch-can contest, had each greased their bodies previously. Neither can get a grip, and the whole business is not fairly playing the game.

Had I been the German Ambassador, I should have been worried to find out what all this was about, as two days previously I had been told categorically, before Belgium interfered in any way, that 'IF FRANCE BECAME INVOLVED WE SHOULD BE DRAWN IN.' Therefore this subsequent round in the contest, with its slippery grips, was of no real use except to give the gallery value for their money.

I must quote another dispatch which is also puzzling:

'Foreign Office, August 2, 1914. After the Cabinet this morning I gave M. Cambon the following memorandum :—

'"I am authorised to give an assurance that, if the German fleet comes into the Channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against French coasts or shipping, the British fleet will give all the protection in its power.

'"This assurance is of course subject to His Majesty's Government receiving the support of Parliament, and must not be taken as binding His Majesty's Government to take action until the above contingency of action by the German fleet takes place."

'I pointed out that we had very large questions and most difficult issues to consider, and that Government felt that they could not bind themselves to declare war upon Germany necessarily if war broke out between France and Germany to-morrow, but it was essential to the French Government, whose fleet had long been concentrated in the Mediterranean, to know how to make their dispositions with their north coast entirely undefended. We therefore thought it necessary to give them this assurance. It did not bind us to go to war with Germany unless the German fleet took the action indicated, but it did give a security to France that

would enable her to settle the disposition of her own Mediterranean fleet.'[69]

This is a delightful example of distortion of a picture by being too close up to it to get it properly focused by the mental lens.

If Germany and France go to war we do not necessarily 'declare war upon Germany.' Not at all! All we do is to tell Germany that she must give her adversary the great handicap of not using her fleet! If we were not at war, and yet Germany was not to 'send her fleet into the Channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against' the coast or shipping of the Power with whom she was at war, whatever was Germany to do with her fleet? She would be too much occupied to make it a success in the way of steamboat excursions, and she would naturally want to use it in some way or other, as at that early date she had not recognised that it was what may be called a stationary fleet. Of course it DID bind us to go to war with Germany. It was an act of war in itself on our part, and a direct and prearranged consequence of our secret consultations two years previously. It was these heart-to-heart talks two years before which had given 'a security to France which would enable her to settle the disposition of her own Mediterranean fleet.'

In the remaining paragraph of this dispatch, when asked about the neutrality of Belgium, Sir Edward Grey stated: 'I said that was a much more important matter; we were considering what statement we should make in Parliament to-morrow—in effect, whether we should declare violation of Belgian neutrality to be a *casus belli*.'

They might have saved themselves the trouble. The undertaking that they had already considered and given to France required no other *casus belli*; as if a war broke out between France and Germany, and we did not allow Germany to make use of her fleet, OF COURSE that was war with us also, and on our own declaration.

One more quotation, this time in regard to the

[69] E. 148.

'British interests in Servia' which were stated to be 'nil.'

As early as 27th July 1914, Sir Edward Grey had told the Russian Ambassador in London what he embodied in his dispatch to the Russian Minister.

'London, July 27, 1914. "In these circumstances," continued Grey, "if Austria were to begin hostilities in spite of that reply, she would prove her intention of crushing Servia. Looked at in that light, the question might give rise to a situation which might lead to a war in which all the Powers would be involved."'[70]

That is the worst of such a lot of confusing cross lights. Why was it not possible to go on looking at the thing in the light which showed so plainly that 'British interests in Servia were nil, and a war on behalf of that country would never be sanctioned by British public opinion.'

Here is an instance where British public opinion might have been asked to speak for itself. It would have been much more satisfactory than guessing at it, in lights which could make it appear anything from black to white; polished like glass or rough as a hedgehog, a variety quite controllable by the examiner shifting his own position so as to acquire the light he desired.

The light in which this fact was regarded by the Russian Ambassador in London is given in reference 59, *q.v.*

I make no apology for going at some length into the British White Papers, as this best illustrates my point that it is the idiotic diplomatic system which is more at fault than the workers. For years past each diplomatic circle has been manufacturing fragmentary relationships with each other circle. Each circle has, therefore, a complete set of these unconnected trifles. The relationships of A with B are totally different from the relationships of B with any other letter of the alphabet, and from the respective relationships of any single letter with any other single letter.

In such circumstances, how is it possible for any one

[70] R. 42.

diplomatic circle to calculate events at all? Each circle which comes into the discussion throws a fresh unknown quantity of fragments into an already hopeless confusion, composed of any two or more equally chaotic collections. This process is repeated with each circle involved until the workers themselves are utterly bewildered and cannot be relied upon even to pick out their own fragments from the hopeless pattern. The old kaleidoscope was the veriest amateur in the way of incalculable appearances compared to diplomacy.

Even Sir Edward Grey cannot pick out his own fragments, and he is acknowledged by Europe as the straightest player among them.

Hence we find two statements like the following offered to us as a match when they are really diametrically opposed.

Please note the date of this extract:

'Foreign Office, November 22, 1912. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to co-operate in war.' [71]

'Foreign Office, August 2, 1914.—I am authorised to give an assurance that, if the German fleet comes into the Channel or through the North Sea to undertake hostile operations against French coasts or shipping, the British fleet will give all the protection in its power.

'. . . It was essential to the French Government, whose fleet had long been concentrated in the Mediterranean, to know how to make their dispositions with their north coast entirely undefended.' [72]

In 1912: Take your fleet to the Mediterranean. We will pool fleets, and if the German fleet comes out of harbour while you and Germany are at war, it will only be under a guarantee that they are only acting as excursion steamers for week-ends at the seaside. You must remember that this is no undertaking in time of war, but you may be certain that if that German fleet

[71] E. 105. Enclosure 1. [72] E. 148.

attempts to take any part in its own country's war, we will look after that. Don't worry, but let your own fleet just dispose in the warm sun of the Mediterranean!

If each diplomatic circle was astonished only at the unsuspected pattern presented by its own fragments as they tried to blend with those of the other groups, there would be no great harm done. But it leads to considerable friction when one man finds that the other man's pattern had turned out so paralysing in novelty that it was beyond any fair sporting forecast.

'Berlin, July 29, 1914.—Up to quite the last days they flattered themselves here that England would remain out of the question, and the impression produced on the German Government and on the financiers and business men by her attitude is profound.' [73]

Three prominent classes misled by the previous form! No wonder they feel somewhat hurt.

It is important to notice that the attitude of England, which so upset these men, was BEFORE the knowledge of the German Chancellor's reply, upon which was founded the indignant statement regarding the infamous proposal.

M. Cambon described this in a dispatch sent off on 29th July, so it must have been known in Berlin early on that date; whereas it was only on the same date (29th July) that Sir F. Goschen informed Sir Edward Grey:

'Berlin, July 29, 1914. I questioned his Excellency about the French colonies, and he said that he was unable to give a similar undertaking in that respect.' [74]

Here is the entry of Belgium, after two previous eventualities which would not allow England to stand aside.

'Brussels, July 31, 1914. The French Minister came to show me a telegram from the Agence Havas reporting a state of war in Germany and said: "I seize this opportunity to declare that no incursion of French troops into Belgium will take place, even if considerable forces are massed upon the frontiers of your country.

[73] F. 92. [74] E. 85.

. . . I thanked Monsieur Klobukowski for his communication. . . . We have also every reason to believe that the attitude of the German Government will be the same as that of the Government of the French Republic.' [75]

At any rate we have disentangled one item thus far: on 27th July Sir Edward Grey said that any intention of Austria to crush Servia would, 'looked at in this light give rise to a situation which might lead to a war in which all the Powers would be involved' (70). On 29th July the 'attitude of England' convinced many poor fellows in Berlin that England was not going to 'remain out of the question' (73).

On 31st July Sir Edward Grey personally informs the German Ambassador that 'if France became involved we should be drawn in' (75).

Now we get a fourth nation, Belgium, stating, upon 31st July, that 'we have every reason to believe that the attitude of the German Government will be the same as that of the Government of the French Republic.'

We have already seen England's attitude was sufficiently definite to quite destroy the established opinion in Berlin that we would not come in, on 29th July. This was before the refusal to guarantee the French colonies, and two days BEFORE the Belgian Government declared that they still trusted Germany. I therefore hope that we, as a nation, will in the future be content with the fact that we are in this war in the cause of justice; that we never yet entered a war with hands clean enough to be mentioned; that our motives in this war are honest and essential for the future of the human race; and that our sacrifices are probably more than compensated by the extermination of that hideous lunacy of militarism. But let us drop the cheap catchword of 'infamous proposal' as a cause of the war. It was only a peg erected subsequently, but serving admirably to hang a tag upon. And further let us not claim canonisation for our entering the war to defend Belgian neutrality. We are defending it, and mean to

[75] B. 9.

do so, and claim damages. We are proud of this. But it had nothing to do with our actual entering the war. We could not have avoided it apart from this question. Not only is the claim that we only fought to preserve Belgium false, but it ought to be too thin to deceive anybody who will remember those two days' interval, 29th to 31st July. It is important to remember the fact that a letter was sent to the Prime Minister by the leaders of the Opposition as late as 2nd August, urging that we should go to war. In this letter there is no mention of Belgium, but only of our 'obligations to France and Russia.'

I trust that no critic will be sufficiently dishonest to say that I am in any way defending the violation of Belgian neutrality.

I denounce it as an atrocity, and with probably more perfect hatred than the great majority of men; as it was an atrocity committed in furtherance of that criminal insanity of war.

I strenuously defend our part in assisting Belgium, and hope that it will be mostly through our determination that the disgrace will be riveted round the neck of the Prussian, and the damages taken from the Prussian's pocket. To show the justice of exacting the uttermost farthing from the Prussian, I will indicate shortly the studied lying which they observed towards Belgium.

We have already seen that, on 31st July, the Belgian Government wrote: 'We have also every reason to believe that the attitude of the German Government will be the same as that of the Government of the French Republic' (75).

I give the whole of the following dispatch from the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs, as it traces this Prussian lie throughout several years:

'Brussels, July 31, 1914. In the course of the conversation which the Secretary-General of my Department had with Herr von Below this morning, he explained to the German Minister the scope of the military measures which we had taken, and said to him that they

were a consequence of our desire to fulfil our international obligations, and that they in no wise implied an attitude of distrust towards our neighbours. The Secretary-General then asked the German Minister if he knew of the conversation which he had had with his predecessor, Herr von Flotow, and of the reply which the Imperial Chancellor had instructed the latter to give. In the course of the controversy which arose in 1911 as a consequence of the Dutch scheme for the fortification of Flushing, certain newspapers had maintained that in the case of a Franco-German war Belgian neutrality would be violated by Germany. The Department of Foreign Affairs had suggested that a declaration in the German Parliament during a debate on foreign affairs would serve to calm public opinion, and to dispel the mistrust which was so regrettable from the point of view of the relations between the two countries. Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg replied that he had fully appreciated the feelings which inspired our representations. He declared that Germany had no intention of violating Belgian neutrality, but he considered that in making a public declaration Germany would weaken her military position in regard to France, who, secured on the northern side, would concentrate all her energies on the east. Baron van der Elst, continuing, said that he perfectly understood the objections raised by Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg to the proposed public declaration, and he recalled the fact that since then, in 1913, Herr von Jagow had made reassuring declarations to the Budget Commission of the Reichstag respecting the maintenance of Belgian neutrality. Herr von Below replied that he knew of the conversation with Herr von Flotow, and that he was certain that the sentiments expressed at that time had not changed.' [76]

This proves that the Prussian Government repeatedly renewed this lie from 1911 throughout 1913. I now give another extract from the Belgian book, also in full:

'Berlin, May 2, 1913. I have the honour to bring to your notice the declarations respecting Belgian

[76] B. 12.

neutrality, as published in the semi-official *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, made by the Secretary of State and the Minister of War, at the meeting of the Budget Committee of the Reichstag on 29th April : "A member of the Social Democrat Party said : 'The approach of a war between Germany and France is viewed with apprehension in Belgium, for it is feared that Germany will not respect the neutrality of Belgium.' Herr von Jagow, Secretary of State, replied : 'Belgian neutrality is provided for by International Conventions and Germany is determined to respect those Conventions.' This declaration did not satisfy another member of the Social Democrat Party, Herr von Jagow said that he had nothing to add to the clear statement he had made respecting the relations between Germany and Belgium. In answer to fresh enquiries by a member of the Social Democratic Party, Herr von Heeringen, the Minister of War, replied : 'Belgium plays no part in the causes which justify the proposed reorganisation of the German military system. That proposal is based on the situation in the East. Germany will not lose sight of the fact that the neutrality of Belgium is guaranteed by international treaty. A member of the Progressive Party having once again spoken of Belgium, Herr von Jagow repeated that his declaration in regard to Belgium was sufficiently clear.'" ' [77]

I quote this report in full for two reasons : it fixes the lie on 29th April 1913. I have already quoted from a secret memorandum issued in Berlin on 19th March 1913, in which appear the following sentences :— '. . . But in the next European war it will also be necessary that the small states should be forced to follow us or be subdued. In certain conditions their armies and their strong positions can be rapidly conquered or neutralised ; this would probably be the case with Belgium and Holland. . . .' [78]

Both the Secretary of State and the Minister of War knew of this secret memorandum, and therefore their

[77] B. 12. Enclosure.
[78] F. 2. Enclosure, Section II.

repeated statements in the Reichstag on 29th April 1913 were deliberate lies. The other point about this reference is, that I desire to congratulate the Social Democrat Party heartily upon their honest endeavours to ensure truth and justice in politics, and at the same time to express my sorrow that they should find that this action almost alienates them from the rest of politicians.

Here is another illustration of the disgusting methods of diplomacy.

Although the fortification of Flushing was—to say the least—not without the benedictions—and aspirations—of the Prussians in 1911, we get the assurance about Belgian neutrality. Although on 19th March 1913 we get the specific statement that Belgium would 'be forced to follow us or be subdued,' yet within six weeks the Secretary of State utters a triple denial in the Reichstag, and the Minister of War prevaricates. Having 'dressed his shop window' with the lie of 'respect for Belgian neutrality,' it is only the usual cowardice for the same man to stutter some insane apology when the time comes to 'deliver the fraudulent goods,' and in the Reichstag, 4th August 1914, he actually, with consummate impertinence, offered the following :—

'. . . We were, therefore, compelled to ride rough-shod over the legitimate protests of the Governments of Luxemburg and Belgium. For the wrong which we are thus doing, we will make reparation as soon as our military object is attained.' [79]

Considering that the destruction of Belgium was planned in the order issued in March 1913, this statement is amazing in its brazen impudence. However, I would like to call the attention of the Allies to the portion of it which promises that the Prussians 'will make reparation.' This must be exacted to the uttermost, quite irrespective of any consideration as to whether they will really gladly acknowledge that their 'military object is attained.' There may be conflicting views amongst them as to how far they have proceeded

[79] B. 35.

in the direction of perfect realisation, but there must be no difference of opinion as to how far they shall atone for their protracted lying, and their whirlwind of bestial atrocities.

Five months after the beginning of the war, the Russian Government issued a copy of a telegram sent by the Tsar to the Kaiser on 29th July 1914. It is implied that this was suppressed when the German White Paper was published. It certainly does not appear in either of the translations I possess, although a telegram of the same date from the Tsar is given. It seems to me strange that it was omitted from the Orange Paper published by Russia, but this does not give any of the inter-monarchical telegrams. This newly published telegram is very interesting. It illustrates the mean duplicity of diplomacy in conveying a lie by suppressing a truth. In this direction it adds to Germany's guilty account. While I cannot acknowledge that it really disturbs the evidence of the Russian policy of extension of power over the Balkans, and the consequent towering threat which fostered militarism in Prussia, and through this channel to all Europe, I gladly welcome the sane and noble tone of the whole message. It is a personal honour of the Tsar and a kind of reflection of the glory which is his for his original courage embodied in the Hague Conferences. Here it is:

'Thanks for your telegram, which is conciliatory and friendly, whereas the official message presented to-day by your Ambassador to my Minister was conveyed in a very different tone. I beg you to explain this divergency. It would be right to give over the Austro-Serbian problem to the Hague Conference, I trust in your wisdom and friendship.'

For such a sane and rational expression, as rare in diplomacy as a diamond in a mud-pie, Russia can be forgiven much. The extension of this spirit in the world would do more for the human race than the forcible aggression of any national culture or 'kultur.'

As perhaps the Kaiser has forgotten to explain this divergency, I hasten to suggest the true explanation.

From the wording of the telegram we notice that it must have arrived in the latter part of the day, as it alludes to 'the official message presented to-day by your Ambassador.' We have already found that it was in the EARLY portion of the same day that the report was sent: 'Up to quite the last days they flattered themselves here that England would remain out of the question, and the impression produced on the German Government and on the financiers and business men by her attitude is profound.' [80]

Now it is indisputable that the Kaiser would be included under the first class. His million or so in Krupp's ought to entitle him to membership of the second class; and his impudent actions at Buckingham Palace prove keen, but perverted, business qualities. So, this 'profound impression' sent the telegram embodying such politeness as to startle his relative.

Again, we ought to make allowances for the terrifying shock of the suggestion of reference to the Hague Conference. The Kaiser had already taken advantage of the 'cowardice of aggregated jealousies.' But he could not be certain that the same weakness of intellect would persist through another discussion upon the crime of war. He had himself denounced the 'degrading ideas of peace,' and bemoaned that military mania might become unfashionable, and had given instructions for its canonisation as a counterblast. Perhaps other nations also suffered from the disease which would reverse insanity, and restore sanity!

Horrible thought! Better leave the telegram unanswered than run such a risk! I trust, therefore, that the trouble I have taken to make up the Kaiser's deficiency will remove any misunderstanding.

To sum up the diplomatic aspect, I consider that after the evidence I have produced, no jury that was not packed, or dishonest, would give a verdict declaring that 'England went into this war solely to protect Belgium and to establish the sanctity of treaties.'

Two previous statements promising—or threatening—

[80] F. 92.

that we should come in had been made, and Belgian neutrality was only the third time of asking. But apart from this evidence, Germany has a perfect right to produce evidence as to character, and call attention to our total neglect to uphold the sacredness of treaties, when Austria tore up the Treaty of Berlin and stole Bosnia and Herzegovina; and also when Germany appropriated Holstein and Schleswig (1864-1866).

Of course it is quite open to us to declare that Germany always violates treaties when selfish motives prompt, and that she violated a treaty and Belgian neutrality for the selfish motive of gaining an advantage in attacking France. It is absolutely as legitimate for Germany to retort that 'England only finds a Treaty "sacred" when any violation of it brought danger to her own doors.'

The only honest verdict on the whole business is that the diplomatic system, with its essential tact, shrewdness and skill, is an iniquitous contraption which renders both reason and honesty impossible of observance by men of even the highest character.

In reality, it is a pathetic sight to see Sir Edward Grey, whose single-minded honesty is acclaimed throughout the world, hopelessly tangled up by the chaotic jumble of rules, customs and traditions, all of very doubtful morality, which constitute present-day diplomacy.

It is grossly unfair, under such circumstances, to judge any man by what he accomplishes; we must honestly try to estimate and give him credit for his intentions.

But while we are all eager to do this for our own Ministers, it is not only irrational, but also despicably unjust, to deny the same privileges to any other representative of any other nation whatever.

The combined diplomatic services are made up of men of various elevations of character, who are all equally handicapped by identical conditions; and whatever discount for these entanglements we make for the one whom popular opinion in each country

praises as the most just, honesty demands that we take off the same discount from the account credited to him who is held by any critic in any country to be the most blameworthy. Only in this way shall we get a proportion and a judgment which agree with both justice and reason, reducing the true blame to what is justly personal.

But the whole of this discount, which is granted impartially to all, must be added to the damages claimed and insisted upon, from the real criminal. And when the democracies can be got to recognise the evidence, and appreciate the justice of all the counts in the indictment, the accused diplomacy will be immediately sent to its true deserts and executed without mercy, like any other execrable traitor to the human race.

SECTION III

CONSIDERATION OF ONE CHARACTERISTIC EXAMPLE OF THE DIPLOMATIC SYSTEM

Examination of a miniature portrait of the diplomatic system. Showing how the 'Morocco Crisis' embodied evils and dangers inherent therein; demonstrating how selfish interests and blatantly criminal prejudices betrayed the lazy thoughtlessness of the various nationalities (also really criminal); and showing how improved national consciences would judge, and act, upon such incontrovertible and condemning evidence

BEFORE leaving this portion of the subject which deals with the diplomatic system in so far as it is merely dangerous to international relationships through its secrecy and subversion of the exercise of truth and honesty by even the best-intentioned diplomats, I shall consider another instance.

In Section IV. I shall carry the matter farther and prove how the present diplomatic system actively cultivates immorality as a science, and crime as an art, to a greater or less extent in every separate nation.

Thus, many diplomats are compelled to perform acts which, outside its stifling atmosphere, they themselves would repudiate with horror. At the same time the moral tone of each democracy is so lowered that the mere attachment of a parti-coloured label upon which is written that hypocrital word, patriotism, stifles all self-respect, repudiation or even criticism.

Several reasons impel me to consider another diplomatic example. The one we have so far considered deals with the present war, and unfortunately, very many people are unable to control their justifiable passion and sanctify it by incarnating it as an

irresistible moral determination to spare no sacrifice in all that makes life worth living, to resent and repel insolent aggression, punish violation of all laws human and divine, and rescue the freedom of man from the strangling grip of mad autocracy.

These people waste their strength by allowing this natural and commendable passion to riot uncontrolled throughout their whole personality. It is a sadly universal and disastrously crippling weakness. It impedes the very object they desire to accomplish. At its best, it renders them incapable of reason and straight thinking, and renders impossible that solid, deep determination of the national mind which is essential for the satisfactory carrying through of justice, and the establishment of freedom. At its worst, it thwarts the activities of both the Government at home and our brave men on the battle-field, disgraces the national reputation for intelligence, and degrades the mob into riots and violence which are scarcely less brutal than the atrocities of the enemies they blatantly denounce. This unthinking majority has been labelled as 'the man in the street,' whose political opinions can be manipulated by an unprincipled newspaper, rabid partisans seeking to climb on an engineered panic to higher things, and financial sharks sowing the whirlwind at home and the lightning abroad, well knowing that subsequent wreckage is their plunder-perquisite.

I claim that in my treatment of the diplomatic documents regarding the present war I have maintained an attitude as nearly impartial as is humanly possible. Nothing has been set down in malice concerning either an enemy, an ally or ourselves. And I trust that simple justice, free from both prejudice against enemies and cowardly favouritism for ourselves, but applying simple honesty in every case, has been observed.

Still, as I desire to do my best to scotch the attempts of the three principal agencies mentioned when they try (as they ARE trying already) to gather their harvests of hatred, pomp or filthy lucre from the fields ploughed by shells, sown with corpses and irrigated with blood,

I shall consider another diplomatic portrait which has been hustled into the lumber-room to hide its revolting truthfulness. Many may recognise the evils of the diplomatic system as portrayed in an example from which passion has died down. This is my chief reason and hope. Again, ordinary party passion may tend to resent the former example as implicating diplomats of one political denomination.

Therefore, I take an example which includes diplomats from both sides. Further, although removed by more than a decade from the present time, this further example demonstrates the dangers in an unmistakable manner, and shows how each of these diplomatic episodes poisons the whole draught of international relationships. It also proves that these former diplomatic activities—never exhibited to the peoples or their representatives at the time, and carefully buried in the oblivion of the official lumber-room, are in a great measure responsible for the hatreds, the atrocious expenditures upon instruments for international murder, with the consequent brutal neglect of all national life, and the raging inferno of this European war.

The example which embodies these points, and which I shall therefore consider, is that of Morocco.

Let me premise that the danger of secret diplomacy has long been recognised, and that those of us who are working for its overthrow are not a 'new brand of political pirates.'

We do not claim inventive genius, or seek to share the glory of a Columbus by discovering a new world.

We are amazed that such a plain, common-sense policy, which has been advocated by earlier reformers, is still suffocated in a dungeon of traditional privilege. We are astounded that the forces of reason, which so nearly won a triumph almost twenty years ago, have been too cowardly to make repeated assaults until victory crowned their efforts.

On 19th March 1886, the following resolution was moved in the House of Commons by Mr Richard :—

'That in the opinion of this House it is not just or

expedient to embark in war, contract engagements involving grave responsibilities for the nation, and add territories to the Empire without the knowledge or consent of Parliament.'

The motion was only lost by FOUR VOTES ![1]

What blighting influence is it that has permitted Englishmen to submit to a feudal tyranny based upon a majority of FOUR VOTES ?

Why did they not maintain the assault ? Had they done so in 1886, there would have been no Morocco Crisis, no Boer War, and no fratricidal European War, the sole ambition of which is to outdo the accomplishments of the traditional Kilkenny cats.

I shall treat this question as shortly as possible, but still so as to establish my case.

It is unnecessary to go back beyond the year 1900, except to point out that European politics, in so far as it was affected by this question, presented the usual exhibition of the complicated activities of a set of confidence tricksters.

We all know the principles—or want of principles—and the features as shown up in our police courts. There is the ingenuous friend, his ostentatious affluence and beneficence; his childlike and bland financial wiles—right up to the simulated astonishment at the recognition that he has annexed his victims' property without any jeopardy to, or encroachment upon his own.

Britain was thus fraternising with Egypt, and France with Morocco; while, in less ambitious classes of business, Italy and Spain were cultivating the interest of Tripoli and the Riff respectively.

Still they had not really got down to business as yet, and a condition of the more or less open door existed all round.

It seemed to be recognised that real equality was impossible. Britain had the pull in Egypt because of her merchant marine and the Suez Canal; and France in Morocco, because she already had annexed the consignment of somebody's wealth contiguous to it.

[1] *Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy*, p. 170.

This recognition was a sort of honourable understanding, but was no higher up the scale of honour than what is spoken of as the honour among thieves.

After 1900, the plot thickened, and—subsequent to the rumpus to be now mentioned—the two principal operators agreed that a mutual *entente* would prevent overlapping, and that each would really obtain more by devoting their entire energies to their own mining-field than by trying to combine this *magnum opus* with distractive and furtive operations in the other's claim.

This mutual concession and demarcation of spheres of influence over the respective financial and usurious interests provides the illuminating diplomatic illustration which manufactured and laid many of the blocks of the concrete foundations of the present war. France had been jealous of the 'spoils of the Egyptians,' and it had been irritating for the British operator to have to work under the greedy eyes of this envious adept.

Still, it was scarcely fair for France, in 1900, to attempt to steal a march upon her principal rival by squaring the two lesser firms. This she did by politely assuring Italy that 'the eye with which France was looking at Tripoli was a blind eye'; and in the following year offering to Spain, North Central Morocco, including Fez and Zaza and the North Atlantic coast, in each case calmly buying off opposition by the easy—if generous—gifts of somebody else's property.

But alas! 'the best laid schemes o' mice an' men gang aft agley!'

After anxious negotiations through 1901 and 1902, the Spanish negotiator (Señor Sagasta), having noticed ominous suspicion in the eyes of the other first-class operator, suddenly recognised danger. He suddenly resigned, and the new Premier (Señor Silvela) refused to respond to M. Delcasse's urgent appeals to complete the deal.

There is something quite pathetic in the exclamation of Señor Maura in the Cortes on 9th June 1904, when he said: 'For the remainder of my days I should have

been unable to sleep if I had belonged to a Government which had affixed its signature to the Treaty'; and when Señor Silvela added: 'It was Providence which intervened at that moment to show its love for Spain.' In a letter Señor Silvela says that for weak nations it is especially indispensable that 'the most complete loyalty towards neighbours and interested parties in international affairs must be an inflexible rule of diplomacy!' The disconcerting candour of his introduction and the following explanation of the source of this startling introduction of ordinary morality into diplomacy is interesting: 'France offered us her diplomatic support, but this was not sufficient to comfort me under the circumstances'![2]

Of course, the discovery of these secret endeavours irritated the British operator, as he felt that he had almost been defrauded of whatever personal benefits he could have insisted upon as the price of blinding his own Morocco eye.

But there was another deeply interested party—namely Germany—who was quite justifiably annoyed also. Germany had, with commendable good will, recognised that France should be caretaker of the Morocco market-hall; but on the distinct understanding that the door was kept open for equal admission of all. She would have been quite wrong not to protest, and hopelessly weak-minded if she did not resent it, when she found that this caretaker had been surreptitiously trying to pull out the wedge which held the door open, as a preliminary to banging it in the face of former traders upon equal terms.

It was not playing the game even according to the attenuated confraternal code of honour previously mentioned.

Of course it produced tension between France and

[2] See *Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy*, by E. D. Morel, pp. 49-51. It is to this valuable publication that I am indebted for most of the information in this section. It is the duty of every political student to read carefully, and with unprejudiced mind, this book. An edition was published at 1s. in 1915.

Germany; but England was a fellow-sufferer this time.

However, M. Delcassé recognised that he could not steer round the British obstacle, and therefore started a course which would prevent any bump upon the British rock at any rate.

Having made friends with Britain by removing old frictions like Newfoundland and West African boundaries, etc., he came down to real business, and swapped the mutual jealousies over Egypt and Morocco.

This Anglo-Franco-Spanish (Spain cited as Third Party) negotiation is a beautiful example of diplomacy.

There is (unfortunately) nothing peculiar in that portion of it which mutually barters property belonging to somebody else while taking care that others who might like to take a hand are kept in ignorance that any game is being played at all. But this example is sublime in its impudence of appropriating the whole stakes for the three secret players, and at the same time solemnly protesting publicly that they have not even touched a single card themselves!

The evidence is official, and renders both denial and honest defence impossible.

The *bona fides* of the principals was doubtful even in regard to this red-herring declaration called the public treaty; as although Britain communicated to the German Government the declaration so far as it affected Egypt, she did not do so in regard to the portion dealing with Morocco. Lord Percy said, in the House of Commons, on 6th April 1905: 'The declaration of April 8, 1904, between the United Kingdom and France was not officially communicated to the German Government, and there was no communication between H.M. Government in regard to it, so far as it had reference to Morocco.' [3]

M. Delcassé was even more cynically discourteous, and never communicated with the German Government at all; and not even with the Spanish Government until after a protest in the Spanish Cortes in June 1904!

[3] Morel, p. 53.

Now, having guarded themselves by this APPARENTLY honest arrangement, let us examine THE SECRET ARRANGEMENT WHICH WAS ENGINEERED AND CONCLUDED AT THE SAME TIME !

The matter is given so concisely and clearly by Mr Morel that I shall quote his short chapter. It focuses the argument, and will enable me to condense my further treatment of the case into comments and a summary of events.

'CHAPTER XII

'*The Franco-British declaration of October*, 1904, *and the secret convention attached thereto*

'If the character of the Anglo-French Declaration of April, 1904, *i.e.*, the understanding come to between Britain and France, as the world was permitted to know it, was modified by the Secret Articles of which the world was not appraised ; the public Franco-Spanish Declaration of the ensuing October 3 was a mere blind for the secret Convention signed at the same time. The Declaration consists of two sentences. Its purport, the solitary assertion that both Powers "remain firmly attached to the integrity of the Moorish Empire under the sovereignty of the Sultan," and on the part of Spain a declaration of adherence to the Anglo-French Declaration of April 8.

'In the secret Convention,* France and Spain calmly arrange for the partition of Morocco. They do so, of course, with British concurrence, in accordance with Article 8 and secret Article 3 of the Anglo-French understanding,† and the secret Convention is communicated by M. Delcasse to the British Government, which acknowledges receipt of it on October 6.‡ It may be well to insert these communications.

* First published in *Le Matin* in November 1911.

† *Vide* Chapter XI. ‡ British White Book, 6010.

'Letter from the French Ambassador to the Marquess of Lansdowne communicating the Texts of the Franco-Spanish Public Declaration and Secret Convention respecting Morocco.

'M. CAMBON to the Marquess of LANSDOWNE.

'DEAR LORD LANSDOWNE, I am instructed to communicate to you the arrangements which have just been concluded between France and Spain on the subject of Morocco. They were signed on the 3rd inst. by our Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Spanish Ambassador at Paris; they consist of a general Declaration, which will be made public, and of a Convention, which is to be kept secret.

'M. Delcasse, in instructing me to forward to you the text of this agreement, in accordance with Article 8 of our Declaration of the 8th April 1904, pointed out the confidential character of this communication, and instructed me to request you to be good enough to keep the Convention entirely secret. I have, etc.,

'PAUL CAMBON.

'Letter from the Marquess of Lansdowne to the French Ambassador acknowledging the Receipt of the Texts of the Franco-Spanish Public Declaration and Secret Convention respecting Morocco.

'The Marquess of LANSDOWNE to M. CAMBON.

'DEAR M. CAMBON,—I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter of to-day's date, covering the two documents which you had been instructed to communicate to me in accordance with Article 8 of the "Declaration respecting Egypt and Morocco" of the 8th April last.

'I need not say that the confidential character of the "Convention" entered into by the President of the French Republic and the King of Spain in regard to French and Spanish interests in Morocco is fully recognised by us, and will be duly respected. The shorter paper, or "Declaration" made by the two Governments

is, I understand, public property. With best thanks, I am, etc., LANSDOWNE.

'The chief provisions of the secret Convention are these:

'Article 2 establishes the "sphere of influence which falls to Spain by virtue of her possessions on the Moorish coast of the Mediterranean," and where she shall possess the same "right of action" as France has acquired by the Anglo-French understanding in the remainder of the country, *i.e.*, "to preserve order in" and to "provide assistance for . . . all administrative, economic, financial, and military reforms which it may require."* Spain, however, undertakes not to exercise her "right of action" for fifteen years without the consent of France, unless, and here Article 3 leaves the way clear for a cynical breach of the public Declaration, whenever it may suit the French purpose.

'"In case"—says Article 3—"the continuance of the political status of Morocco and of the Shereefian Government should become impossible, or if, owing to the weakness of that Government and to its continued inability to uphold law and order,† OR TO ANY OTHER CAUSE,‡ the existence of which is acknowledged by both parties, the status quo can no longer be maintained, Spain may freely exercise her right of action in the territory defined in the preceding article, which henceforward constitutes her sphere of influence."

'Article 4 defines the Spanish sphere in Atlantic Morocco.§ Article 8 provides that if in the course of exercising this above-stated "right of action" one or other Government is "obliged to take military action, the other contracting party shall at once be informed. In no case shall the assistance of a foreign Power be invoked."

* Article 4. *Vide* Chapter XI.

† Which the French Government, the Algerian Administration and French finance had combined to bring about. *Vide* Chapter III.

‡ These words are really worthy of being italicised.

§ See map.

'Article 10 provides that all schemes for public works railways, etc., mineral development and "economic undertakings in general" in the French and Spanish spheres respectively, *i.e.* IN THE WHOLE OF MOROCCO, "shall be executed" by French and Spanish enterprise.

'Thus British enterprise, and all international enterprise other than French and Spanish (Spanish "enterprise" being what it is—read French), was doubly mortgaged in favour of the French, first by the Anglo-French understanding, secondly by this Convention.

'The further secret Franco-Spanish Accord (September 1, 1905), although antecedent to the Act of Algeciras, and in one sense belonging to that period of our enquiry, may more fittingly be touched upon at a later stage.

'We may now summarise the preceding chapters, which will focus more readily to our intelligence the antecedents to the Act of Algeciras.'[4]

. . . . . .

I entreat readers to read over again this account, substituting the names, 'Brown, Jones and Robinson,' for the names, 'British, French and Spanish,' and some 'international stores' for 'Morocco.'

It will then be seen that Brown will be discretely busy with his new similar duties in another emporium, while, with friendly consideration Jones and Robinson can easily arrange some other cause and acknowledge it with hands on their hearts and glasses in their hands, to complete mutual satisfaction. A similar fraternal conviviality can regulate the complete adjustment of 'economic undertakings in general' and the monopolist 'French and Spanish enterprise.'

Of course no Sunday school book could publicly defend—were it compelled to answer the awkward question—the merely thoughtless gourmandising of all economic enterprise which included a vast amount belonging to Schmit! HE knew nothing about it (here occurs a curious mutual affection causing twitching of an eyelid), and by the time they did let him know, his part of the economy would not be worth his troubling about!

[4] Morel, pp. 58-60.

I congratulate M. Delcasse upon his keen humour. Were it not so grimly unprincipled, it might be amusing.

The essential feature is the duplicity of both the game and of the players. This is demonstrated in the bogus account for publication and the secret contract for the division of the stakes.

The former was embodied in the declaration of 8th April 1904, and the ulterior motive was to blind the other Powers by a plausible and ostensibly genuine—but essentially false—declaration.

'The crucial Article (2) of the arrangement, made public at the time, concerning the future of Morocco was this—

'"The Government of the French Republic declare that they have no intention of altering the political status of Morocco.

'"His Britannic Majesty's Government, for their part, recognise that it appertains to France more particularly as a Power whose dominions are conterminous for a great distance with those of Morocco, to preserve order in that country, and to provide assistance for the purpose of all administrative, economic, financial, and military reforms which it may require.

'"They declare that they will not obstruct the action taken by France for this purpose, provided that such action shall leave intact the rights which Great Britain, in virtue of treaties, conventions, and usage, enjoys in Morocco, including the right of coasting trade between the ports of Morocco, enjoyed by British vessels since 1901."'[5]

What strikes me in the first place is that this may be a very pretty arrangement between France and England, but as they are not the only ones with interests in Morocco, or with 'rights in virtue of treaties, conventions and usage' enjoyed in Morocco, was it mere thoughtlessness, or money-grubbing cunning which caused the unfortunate oversight by which not one of these other equally legitimate interests got even so far as to be included in the catalogue?

[5] Morel, p. 53.

It is impossible to imagine a more unassailable example of diplomacy. Any amount of wriggling cannot shake the evidence, but only excites pity and scorn for the wriggler.

The descent to such methods acclaims the futility of the attempts. Opponents and critics go through the silly performance of confusing the issue by blackguarding those who produce the evidence. Some of them even ask the public such imbecile questions as: 'Who is Mr Morel ?' [6]

It is cunning as well as silliness which actuates them, and unfortunately many people are thereby defrauded into a state of mind upon the same intellectual level as the stork, and by burying their heads in the mud of vituperation, they consider that all danger vanishes with their resulting intellectual blindness.

Such a proceeding is natural—if laughable—in the stork; but it is a sad exhibition of a limited imbecility in a human being.

The question: 'Who is Mr Morel ?' has nothing to do with the case. The only point is: ARE THE DOCUMENTS HE QUOTES GENUINE, OR ARE THEY SPURIOUS ? Will these critics please oblige with a definite answer for once. 'Yes' or 'No' will be honest. Fencing or slang is not.

If these documents are genuine, they themselves—in their primitive nakedness—absolutely prove the case, and render criticism absurd.

It is simply a question of a PUBLIC document declaring one thing and a SECRET document declaring the exactly opposite. ONE of them must necessarily be a lie.

It is not Mr Morel who has to be explained away; but a simple and unambiguous lie.

In Section II. I have myself quoted fairly extensively from the various authorised Government publications. ARE THESE DOCUMENTS GENUINE ? I have given the reference in every case. Do opponents claim that these documents do not exist ?

[6] *E.g.* Mr Cecil Chesterton in *The Daily Dispatch*, 1st June 1915.

Some opponent or critic may embody his amount of wisdom in a question: 'Who is Mr Hayward?' He will thus deserve the same immortality as the man who inscribed all his general knowledge upon a postage-stamp. Of course such a question is interesting to me personally, and it evidently must interest him, or he would not ask it. But I would like to warn him that it is likely to be of no interest to anybody else except, perhaps, a few of my own relations and friends, and—of course especially—to himself.

In any case such a question has nothing whatever to do with the argument. Of course, everybody has a perfect right to quarrel with any personal opinions expressed by either Mr Morel or myself; but the whole gist of the matter is: ARE THE OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS WE PRODUCE GENUINE? If so, strip away everything else, and our case remains unshaken. I am not concerned with the history of subsequent Morocco treaties. This is shown in correct perspective in Mr Morel's excellent book, and should be there studied.

Again, I point out that I am not concerned with the personalities of the diplomats. It is the pernicious diplomatic system which entangles both the just and the unjust in its malevolent meshes.

This example of diplomacy is therefore excellent also in that it proves that it is the diplomatic system itself which is the danger to freedom and democracy; and an insult to even that civilised morality which maintains our present criminal and lunacy statistics.

When M. Delcasse forwarded the bogus and the secret declarations to the British Government at the beginning of October 1904, it was impossible for the Marquess of Lansdowne to do anything else than just follow the traditions of the usual diplomatic game. No matter how much his personal morality was revolted, for him to have suddenly insisted upon rectitude and the putting of all cards on the table—or at least the barring of any concealed cards up the sleeves—would have been as suicidal as for a tenderfoot to accuse a gang of Montana gambling-saloon desperadoes of cheating. Of

course they know it all the time, but what else could the tenderfoot expect where such a tradition was honoured in the observance, but never in the breach ?

The Marquess of Lansdowne could not even honestly express surprise in regard to the surreptitious juggling of the cards. Italy had recently had a trick by similar methods, and Britain was by this very shuffle gaining an odd trick which rendered its past Egyptian score certain of the pool in that game.

Even a super-man would have been compelled to follow suit. It was the rules of the game which needed alteration, so as to ensure fair play. Any individual protest would only have precipitated indiscriminate shooting, bloodshed and the wrecking of the whole gambling saloon, wherein all diplomatic business could ONLY be conducted.

Of course, when the Marquess of Lansdowne handed over his hand of cards to Sir Edward Grey, it merely meant that he himself could get out into purer air, and leave his successor subject to the old foul atmosphere and the crooked morality of the ever-continuing diplomatic poker.

Naturally, Germany had cause for anger in 1911 when the whole affair came out, and she found that she had been left dozing in another part of the saloon, and not asked to take a hand in the game, or even been told that there was any game being played for a pool which contained her stakes, as well as those of the players who designedly kept her in ignorance.

That one lie necessitates many to bolster it up is proved by the amazing series here tabulated from the official French records.

This series shines resplendent when we remember that in 1906 all the actual players joined in signing the Act of Algeciras along with herself, and yet each party to the secret scoop maintained the usual code of honour and resolutely refused to ' blow the gaff ' !

I want here to emphasise a most valuable lesson, taught with such absolute distinctness that it is a marvel it

has, so far, been entirely missed not only by the masses of each nation but even by political students.

This lesson is: that it is the diplomatic system itself which is at fault, and that as the majority of diplomatists themselves are better than this system which they have to work, so the democracies themselves are far better than the diplomatic policies of their respective nationalities.

It is devoid of true reason and grossly unjust that the peoples of any nation should be judged by that nation's diplomacy.

Yet this is exactly what nine-tenths of the peoples themselves and almost the entire Press in each nation, do.

It is as insanely unjust and as criminally disastrous as it would be to condemn and execute sentence of imprisonment or death upon every single employee, down to the office-boy and charwoman, because one of the partners of a great business firm had taken advantage of his position and opportunities secretly to swindle the firm's creditors.

The irresponsible ravings in this country against every individual German, as if he was personally responsible for insane ambitions and criminal atrocities—concerning which he was practically as ignorant and indignant as ourselves—are as bad as the delirious ravings of the equally irresponsible Germans who 'Strafe' every Britisher as if he had personally engineered each disaster in this war.

It would have been impossible to rouse the unreasoning international hatreds and passions had the various peoples possessed even a rudimentary knowledge of true perspective.

I have called the following series of resolutions of the French Chamber 'lies.' . . . I do so again.

But I exonerate every member of the Senate who honestly thought that he was supporting the truth.

To blame any man for supporting what he knows is the only honest course, simply because this has been already traitorously betrayed by the secret and lying

diplomatic system so that he, with all other honest men, could not know of or repudiate the fraud, is to demonstrate the infantile development of reason and justice.

With the limited exceptions of the two or three diplomatists who engineered and knew of this detestable example of the working of the diplomatic machine, the French and English Parliaments and people were innocent.

The resulting popular hatreds were devoid of foundation; the Press slanders, ignorant and unprincipled.

But what must have been the mental condition of those few diplomatists who watched these repeated assertions of honest men?—honest, but deceived members of the French Senate proceeding through this long series of honest protestations which these men themselves knew they had aborted into lies before their birth. Any system which permits of such juggling and deceit is self-condemned.

It has prostituted international morality; blasted international respect and friendships; and its only possible harvest is that which hate and death are now reaping in Europe.

March, 1904. M. Delcasse assures the German Ambassador at Paris that France desires to 'uphold the existing political and territorial status' of Morocco.

The North German Gazette (the official organ of the German Government) declares that, in view of the reiterated assurances of the French Government that France had no territorial designs upon Morocco, German interests, so far as can be gathered at the moment, are in no jeopardy from the Anglo-French negotiations, of which news has been in circulation.

1906. February. Opening of the International Conference at Algeciras attended by Moorish representatives. The Conference draws up an Act, in the name of God Almighty, and 'based upon the threefold principle of the sovereignty and independence of His Majesty the Sultan, the integrity of his dominions, and economic liberty without any inequality.'

The concluding Article of the Act provides that

'All existing Treaties, Conventions and arrangements between the signatory Powers and Morocco remain in force. It is, however, agreed that in case their provisions be found to conflict with those of the present General Act, the stipulations of the latter shall prevail.'

1907. November. French Chamber votes an Order of the Day disclaiming an intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Morocco.

1908. January. French Chamber disclaims any intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Morocco, and proclaims France's intention to observe the Algeciras Act.

June. French Chamber again registers intention to observe Algeciras Act.

1909. January. French Chamber repeats intention to observe Algeciras Act.

February. Franco-German Declaration respecting Morocco. France therein declares herself 'firmly attached to the maintenance of the independence and integrity of Morocco.'

Franco-German discussions as to joint economic enterprises in Morocco and elsewhere continue.

November. French Chamber registers once more intention to observe Algeciras Act.

1911. March. French Chamber declares its intention of upholding the Algeciras Act.[7]

For my purpose, which is at present confined to demonstrating the diplomatic system only as regards this one scoop, it is unnecessary to pursue the matter further, as Mr Morel has so ably done.

In March, 1905, the German Emperor calls at Tangier and declares to the Sultan's representatives that he intends to safeguard German interests in Morocco, and that he looks upon the Sultan as an absolutely independent sovereign.[8]

1911. April. Fez reported blocked by insurgents.

May. General Moinier starts for its relief at the head of 30,000 men.

[7] Morel, pp. 188-190. [8] Morel, p. 188.

May. Germany informs France that she (Germany) reserves to herself complete liberty of action in view of altered status in Morocco.

May. Sir E. Grey publicly approves of French march on Fez.

July. Germany sends *Panther* to Agadir. Advises Powers.

July. Outcry against Germany in British Press, headed by *The Times*. Opinion in France not so pronouncedly hostile.[9]

Now, even everyday honesty (by no means the best brand) would be bound to admit, in regard to the visit of the Kaiser to the Sultan of Morocco in 1905—after the announcement that France and Britain had played for the Morocco pool on the quiet—that it was perfectly justifiable for the German player, who had been carefully kept out of the know, to walk over and have a look at the pool to see if his stakes were still intact. When it became evident, in 1911, that these players had surreptitiously scooped the pool seven years previously, it was a really extremely mild form of protest for Germany to send a small gunboat like the *Panther*, which only had a complement of 125 men and did not —and could not—attempt to even insist upon a square deal. It was merely to notify the players that Germany had a right to ask what had become of her own chips in that pool.

The hysterical ravings of the Press (the same truly 'patriotic' organs which have sold their especial brand of patriotism to impede recruiting and delay victory in the present war) prove nothing but their own immoral insanity.

The unprincipled motives or ignorant prejudices which instigated these yelpings by this Press clique, and which successfully carried out their authors' cunning object of misleading as many of the British people as possible—stand out in all their crookedness when contrasted with the standard gauge of actual facts.

[9] Morel, p. 191.

Germany and France had come to an agreement, in 1909, to observe the Act of Algeciras. In this agreement France—as a matter of habit—protested that she was firmly attached to 'the independence and integrity of Morocco.' Then Germany and France drew up an agreement for co-operation in the French Congo. This was signed in December 1910. It was then abandoned by the French, and again revised, and finally agreed to in February 1911. The French Government which had negotiated it fell, and the new Government declined to ratify it (April, 1911). This Government meanwhile calmly proceeded systematically to occupy Morocco, and marched upon Fez.

It was then—and ONLY then—that Germany sent the *Panther* to Agadir.

The British Press proclaimed that Germany had set up a Naval Station, and shrieked for the dispatch of the entire fleet, with the same amount of brain power as would have made a householder yell for both infantry and cavalry to repel a burglar. Why did not the British people greet this hysteria with derisive laughter?

A boat of 1000 tons, with a complement of 125 men, and carrying two 10·5 guns and six machine guns, and a naval base quite unsuitable for the purpose!

In the French Yellow Book published some time later it was stated that the German Government never made any such claim, and never had any such intention.

Still, *The Times*, *Daily Mail et hoc genus* had eagerly grasped their opportunity of shoving civilisation down the slope of blind prejudice; and gained their object of accelerating the pace of descent to the maddest and blindest animal passions, whose recognised goal was the present degradation of humanity, and the deification of brute force and fiendish cruelty.

There is one sad incident I must mention, and that is the 'Dick Turpin' speech of Mr Lloyd George on 21st July 1911.

He uttered wild threats to Germany, to which she

yielded, and thus dissolved an infamously provoked crisis.

The honour is entirely Germany's.

This speech was made in the name of the British nation, and as spokesman of the British Government. Yet it is the fact that ONLY THREE MEN in the British nation knew about it, and decided upon it; like some heaven-sent trinity. These three men were Mr Asquith, Sir Edward Grey and Mr Lloyd George. Not only were the people or their representatives not consulted, but even their colleagues in the Cabinet were left in ignorance!

But this long series of duplicities and repudiated undertakings naturally embittered Germany against both France and England.

It is enough to make one despair that humanity will ever evolve far enough to deserve—by honest use—its one supreme gift of reason, to see how blind animal passion still renders the majority incapable of even the elements of justice when considering any opponent's position. In January to December 1902, M. Delcasse was carrying on secret negotiations with Spain, and designedly keeping Britain in ignorance as well as Germany and the other Powers.

1902. January-September. M. Delcasse's secret negotiations with Spain continue. M. Delcasse promises France's diplomatic support in the event of objections by a third Power (England). In September the Franco-Spanish Treaty assumes its final shape.[10]

Of course Britain's anger was considered righteous indignation, and really a beatitude; the equally righteous protest from Germany was 'unheard-of impertinence.' I would ask readers to note this curious defect in mental development. They will find that very few of their own friends are quite free from it, as in our present primitive stage of character-education as distinguished from mental dead-stock and rubbish stuffing, it is only by the unceasingly constant and conscious effort to force oneself to apply the standard

[10] Morel, p. 187.

of reason and justice that a very limited minority can be trusted to arbitrate or judge. The eccentricity is developed into a farcical hysteria in many newspaper staffs and offices, and we find that—although you search history for the really dirtiest job ever performed by Britain, still, we have never used anything except 'an agricultural implement adapted for digging'; whilst our so-called rivals of other nationalities have never yet been able to acquire anything more respectable than what these papers, etc., hysterically allude to as 'a b—— shovel.'

After this digression—and would that it were a digression in daily life instead of the usual stock in trade of these journals—we will resume the account of what caused this outcry in the British Press. In 1904 England was taken into the secret game, and—of course although brothers in adversity in 1902—in 1904 Germany had not a fragment of that identical basis which had been Britain's one foundation two years previously.

Germany would not have been fit to attend a national kindergarten if she had not been suspicious after October 1904.

'1904. October. Reuter's Agency in Paris declares that every detail of the Franco-Spanish negotiations has been made known to the British Government, that the terms of the Treaty are regarded with satisfaction by the French, Spanish, and British Governments, and that it contains a number of secret clauses which will not be made public.'[11]

If ever 'diplomatic temper' deserved the *alias* of 'righteous indignation' it was certainly when Germany discovered that these just suspicions became virtual certainties in 1911.

The secret clauses were never torn from their hiding-place until November 1911, and the light then thrown upon them casts a lurid reflection upon the long procession of false declarations strung out during the preceding seven years.

Alas! public opinion, maliciously duped by these

[11] Morel, p. 188.

Billingsgate Yahoos of the Press and similar justice-free and prejudice-ridden leaders, yelled with rage because the defrauded negotiator complained, and from no higher motive than that THIS TIME their own nation shared in the surreptitious scoop !

The Daily Mail—that imp amongst the national cog-wheels which has unfortunately even yet escaped being crushed during one of the calamitous dislocations it has done most to engineer—said in an article dealing with an opinion expressed by Professor Hans Delbruck, in Berlin :—'As regards the professor's description of British action in the Morocco crisis—"a malicious interference with legitimate German aspirations"—*The Daily Mail* pointed out that British policy was dictated only by a treaty well known to all the world, the Anglo-French Convention of 1904, whereby we were bound to give France support in Morocco.' [12]

This is simply false.

The Anglo-French Treaty of 1904 was NOT 'known to all the world.' Both France and England had taken good care of that. The simple truth is: 'It should be constantly borne in mind that the secret Articles of the Anglo-French Declaration, and the secret Franco-Spanish Convention only became publicly known in November 1911, through the indiscretion of a couple of French newspapers.' [13]

Amazing as it seems, even such a transparent deception as this statement of *The Daily Mail* would lead many into condoning the vulgar abuse hurled at Germany on the ground that she had no cause, as it was known to all the world, when every single honest man knew for a fact that the publication of this secret game, only a week or two earlier, was as great a surprise to Germany as it was to both the French and the English democracies themselves.

Thus is demonstrated the feebleness of the average sense of judgment ! It is defrauded by a blatant yell of what it knows to be an untruth ; just as readily as it is gulled by the emphasis of a patent medicine

[12] *Daily Mail*, 27th December 1911. [13] Morel, p. 65.

advertisement which it recognises guarantees the impossible.

It ought to be unnecessary to produce recorded facts to substantiate any contradiction of *The Daily Mail*; but the subject is too important, and the pernicious influence of perverted statements too serious to omit the precaution of going for the hammer and nail, and determinately fastening the spurious coin to the counter to prevent further attempted currency.

As stated before, *The Daily Mail* said, on 27th December 1911: '. . . *The Daily Mail* pointed out that British policy was dictated by a Treaty well known to all the world.' This is not one of the many similar statements concocted for some temporary purpose and then buried in kindly oblivion. It is regarded by *The Daily Mail* as a bright jewel in its self-conferred diadem as King of Newspapers. So highly is it prized by its manufacturer that it has been proudly reproduced since the outbreak of the war in that sixpenny paper-backed production [14] evidently fondly regarded as a mixture of —but of course an improvement upon—the wisdom of Solomon and the prophecies of Isaiah. Now even if the consequences be awkward for itself, *The Daily Mail* can scarcely deny that France is fairly entitled to a claim to be included in all the world.

This assumption ought to pass unchallenged, as the country mentioned is more easily got at and verified than Peking. I fear that *The Daily Mail* will find it difficult to reconcile its statement with the words of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, speaking on 6th February 1912:

'The French Parliament, by an abuse morally, if not constitutionally, unpardonable, was kept in ignorance of this policy. . . . Far from ensuring general peace, the arrangements of 1904 tended to compromise it. . . . Why was the French Parliament told only half the truth when it was asked to pass its opinion upon our arrangement with England? Why was it not allowed to suspect that this arrangement had as its complement

[14] *Scaremongerings*, from *The Daily Mail*, 1896-1914.

and corrective some secret clauses and other secret Treaties ? It is this, it is this double game towards Parliament and towards the world which becomes morally an abuse of trust. . . . Now the whole effect of the arrangement of 1904 appears to-day in its truth and in its vanity. It was a Treaty of friendship with England recognising the freedom of our political action in Morocco and also proclaiming our will to respect the integrity of that country ; that was what the public knew and approved. But the public was ignorant that at the same time, by other Treaties and by contradictory clauses hidden from it, the partition of Morocco between Spain and France was prepared, of that Morocco of which we guaranteed the integrity. There existed two irreconcilable French policies in Morocco, that of public arrangements, that is to say, a policy of integrity which was not the true one ; and that of secret arrangements postulating a Protectorate and the partition of Morocco.' [15]

M. de Lamarzelle was even more emphatic :

'This secret Franco-Spanish Treaty interests Spain, no doubt, but it interests still more England, by whom and for whom it was made. . . . Why was this secret Treaty hidden ? I can find no other reason than this, that perhaps if Parliament had been told all the sacrifices which were imposed upon us by this secret Treaty, the public Treaty would not have been voted.' [16] (7th February.)

M. Ribot, the Father of the House, speaking on the 9th, also accentuated the cynical contradiction between public professions and private commitments :

'In 1904 a Treaty was signed—a secret Treaty—whose clauses we have only recently learned . . . ; it was a Treaty of partition and has created difficulties which are not yet all cleared away. Spain was bound to consider, and did consider, that it was a partition of sovereignty between France and Spain at the very time when a public Act declared that the two nations

[15] Morel, pp. 80-81. [16] Morel, p. 81.

were profoundly attached to the independence and to the integrity of Morocco.' [17]

We therefore recognise that either the statement that the treaty was known to all the world is quite untrue, or that France was not a portion of the world, at any rate during the years 1904 to 1911.

The Daily Mail might offer a prize to anybody outside its own staff who would spot which of these only two alternatives is correct. It is still more sad to recognise that, according to *The Daily Mail*, England itself (and, of course, therefore, Carmelite House and all that it stands for) was non-existent as an integral portion of 'all the world' during these seven years.

'The existence, and in part the actual substance of Secret Articles attached to the Anglo-French Declaration over Morocco was revealed in *Le Temps* of November 11, 1911. A question was then put in the House of Commons; Sir Edward Grey admitted in reply the existence of Secret Articles, and they were subsequently communicated to Parliament. The Secret Franco-Spanish Convention of October 1904, was published in *Le Matin* of November 9, 1911, reproduced in *Le Temps* of the same evening, and afterwards published in a British White Book together with the Exchange of Notes between Lord Lansdowne and the French Ambassador concerning it. The effect of these two Treaties—the second arose out of the first and was, indeed, imposed upon France by the British Government—was to involve this country in approved and diplomatic support of a partition of Morocco between France and Spain, and thereby, to inevitable conflict with Germany, as explained in this volume. This is not the expression of an opinion; but a bald statement of fact.' [18]

The history of the Morocco Crisis offers for study a miniature portrait of diplomacy; reproducing its varied features and expressions with photographic accuracy.

The disastrous feebleness of rational thinking and

[17] Morel, p. 81.

[18] Morel, Introduction, p. xix. See also reference 3.

true education in all nations has so far missed the lessons of this—as of all other—happenings.

Each national mind but embodies the sad features of the millions of individual minds composing it, and therefore we behold the lamentable spectacle of the world-stream of life and thought bearing along upon itself only fragmentary chips of shallow humanity, diverted by every bubble, impeded by every floating leaf, submerged by every ripple, buffeted by every eddy, and stranded upon every pebble.

Few attempt to steady even their own individual fragment with the ballast of true education, and the best attainable keel of reason and justice so that their own barque upon the voyage of life may keep its head to the true channel and escape the shoals and rocks. As one of these few, I again ask the flotsam and jetsam : Why have you neglected this Morocco warning ? And will you—in your mad thoughtlessness even fail to heed the present demented rush into the maelstrom of brutality which threatens to suck you all to destruction, and to wreck the entire human race ?

Let every man and woman recognise that unless they develop and conscientiously utilise the stability of honest thought and reason, they are but useless and disfiguring rubbish upon the stream of life ; littering its surface in the smooth and sunny expanses, choking its course and frustrating its onward flow in every channel of usefulness, damming back with their helpless ignorance life's stream at each dangerous rapid, and producing floods and catastrophes for which, in justice, they alone are criminally responsible.

In this history of the Morocco Crisis, how many of even the more balanced minds have recognised the faithful reproduction of the following catalogue of diplomatic features ?

1. The all-pervading iniquitous diplomatic system of secret intrigue, dishonesty, plotting to filch some coveted property of one or more members, with or without one or more confederates, and with the defrauding of one or more victims.

2. The prostitution of honour for the wages of sin, as shown in France's attempt to induce Spain (by promises of restricted percentage of the booty) to assist her in the secret burglary of Morocco. The frustration of this by the intervention of a jealous rival—*i.e.* England. The new plot *à trois*, and the successful resulting burglary. France acting in the interests of the financial stakes of her investing class and her usurers. England embodying the demands of her own financial speculators and her money-lenders; and any undignified blowing the gaff obviated by the criss-cross arrangement of mutually balancing each other's shekels in each department.

3. The ignorant and hysterical minds of each nationality; rendering them the silly tools of

4. Cynical and unprincipled political agitators and financial touts; and of

5. Blatant, brainless and tub-thumping press proprietors, who are also instigated, apart from financially, either by

6. The pseudo-patriotic class of bull-frog distended patriots, who have no conception of the true significance of that term, but apply it to each new freakish prejudice evolved in each excited and unreasoning exponent. This class embracing

7. The sea-water-on-the-brain 'X' power navyites; who would even demand one Dreadnought for every share certificate they hold out of the United Kingdom; and

8. The conscriptionist or military party, who clamour for a battalion of soldiers ready to be dispatched at their call whenever a distant foreign dividend shows signs of the restricting nature of free competition. Finally the

9. Sadly great masses of well-disposed but thoughtless dupes of these engineered interests, who themselves desire peace and happiness, but who are so ignorant and characterless that—like yokels in a village—they will leave house duties and all classes of work neglected to run, open-eyed and gaping-mouthed, after

clowns and a circus. So these masses—through ignorance and thoughtlessness—succumb to the fraudulent quacks, the juggling clowns, the strident drum of the politico-financial circus, and shout insanely for the glamour of military and naval circus costumes and the excitement and sensationalism of shining combats.

The poor dupes do not recognise that this national diplomatic circus is not an entertainment either instructive or amusing, but a suggestive lure to vice and profligacy.

I have written this book, and emphasised the Morocco incident, in the hope of helping the thoughtless throng to recognise that in the limelight of truth this diplomacy, with its essential armies and navies—even when excused upon the plea of human nature—is, at its highest computation, nothing except uniformed and organised hooliganism. When bare justice and reason strip off its trappings and rags, it is revealed as a grinning skeleton composed of mean covetousness of financial gain, hatred and cheating instead of love and service for fellow human beings, and the despicable selfishness of inflated pomp.

SECTION IV

DIPLOMACY ENGENDERS FALSE IDEALS AND PERVERTED MORALITY; AND HAS SERIOUSLY DEBASED THE AMBITIONS AND MORAL TONE OF EVERY NATION

The application of a moderate—but rigid—rational morality to diplomatic methods

THE fact embodied in the above statement is, in my opinion, the most important aspect of the case. I maintain that it is a fact which cannot be refuted, and for which excuses or apologies only offer further and damning evidence.

I did not deal with it in my previous sections as I judged that it would be wiser, in my opening statement, to forecast the case and plainly indicate the standard which ought to be maintained by any truly self-respecting individual or group of individuals.

Then I deemed it best to indicate the line to be taken in the evidence upon which I should rely, and to offer such evidence as I claim cannot fail to convince the Court of British (and I trust also Foreign) Opinion, that there is a very strong case to go before the jury for their consideration and verdict.

In the present section I shall produce evidence as to the character of the defendant, and in my concluding sections try to demonstrate the universal and immeasurable damages, both special and general, which the defendant has caused in the past, is causing in the present, and will cause, if possible, in intensified degrees and extent, in the future.

Finally I shall demand a just and true verdict, based upon the evidence; a decisive and unanimous verdict of guilty, followed by immediate execution of the criminal.

In the name of humanity itself, and according to simple honesty, truth and reason, I claim that no man can hear this case and still preserve the only possession which makes life worth living—namely, his own self-respect—if he even attempts to excuse the defendant, diplomacy, as it exists to-day, upon any ground of extenuating circumstances.

The men forming the jury are not judging for themselves alone, but for their children and the whole human race, and they are traitors to both of these classes if they fail to insist that nothing less than absolute and impersonal justice is pronounced and completely executed. Mercy may be a crime; and in such an inquiry, where the whole future of those who come after them is committed to their charge, they are not interested so much as to whether their own more or less short lives will be affected, but they are 'the trustees of the future,' and have no right whatever to permit any personal anxiety, any sympathetic associations, any delusion about average morality, any self-interest, moral cowardice or mental laziness, to permit the slightest trace of foundation upon which coming generations may base, ought to base, and WILL base, an accusation that in the year 1915 these trustees betrayed their solemn trust, defrauded the beneficiaries, and condemned them to a life of moral degradation, and to a poverty of freedom which cramps their nature, limits their happiness, and stultifies their stature.

The evidence already produced proves beyond contention that the present international diplomacy is governed absolutely by a code of morals and procedure quite different from those which are—or ought to be—observed between man and man within either nations, societies or families. It also proves that the diplomatic standard of morality is debased and far inferior to any standard which would be AT PRESENT regarded as satisfactory, or even tolerated, in the other relationships. Such a position is an impossible one. No specious arguments, no claims of custom, no class interests, no

easy-going thoughtlessness, can in the slightest degree evade the absolute impossibility of running two concurrent, but different, standards of morality.

That no two entities can continue to move in absolutely parallel lines is as much a law of psychological nature as gravity is of physical nature. There will always be mutual attraction and convergence, with eventual blending of the paths of progression. Without the ceaseless and conscientious application of the correcting and elevating force of reason, human nature naturally tends, according to the law of animal gravity, to fall towards the original animal level, from which it started its human trajectory.

Therefore only unreasoning human beings would form the opinion that the higher of these two working moralities will influence the lower in an upward or higher direction.

It would be against human statics, in which the only upward-propelling force is that of free reason. It is for the honest and unceasing exercise of this one lifting power that I plead.

Unless humanity insists upon the elevation of the lower diplomatic standard, quite up to the social standard, no human power can prevent the social from sinking to the diplomatic.

The flouting of gravity, and perpetual motion, will be ensured at the same moment as any human effort overcomes the depression of higher morality to lower whilst refusing courageously to utilise the accessory lifting force of human reason.

Any attempted defence of the present condition can be offered only by any man whose own moral development does not rise above the lower of the two standards, or who will not recognise the impossibility of running in two directions at one and the same time.

We shall find that the cloak of diplomacy covers each and all of the following list of faults :—selfish personal aggrandisement ; class interests and prejudices ; the discussing and settlement of the happiness and destinies of millions of fellow-beings just as if they were extra

buttons upon some monarch's coat, or coins in his pocket, to be transferred, bartered or gambled in a suspiciously conducted game in some gambling saloon; the bluffing, dodging or actual cheating from which this game is never free, although each trick involves more personal risk to unconsulted millions than to any individual player; the demonstrated prevarications and lying; the violation of any previous contract, and the even chance that such contract was originally obtained by fraud as by honest dealing; but perhaps above all, the deification of brute force over every question of justice, and the cultivation of that meanest of all crimes, spying, which, whether performed for the ruin of a so-called enemy or not, makes every man who engages in it a despicable traitor to a fellow-man or group of fellow-men.

If all these, and other proceedings, which are essential constituents of present-day diplomacy, are to be tolerated, excused or permitted to exist as the acknowledged system of morals in questions affecting more of the human race than any other question can possibly influence; and if the observance of these debased morals is to be regarded as still leaving its exponents perfectly moral and honest men, what in the universe is the reason why any man, anywhere, should observe any code of morality superior to one which would still leave him the status of saint even were his actions detrimental to more thousands of fellow-creatures than he will ever meet or affect individually throughout the longest possible existence ?

There can be no answer to that question. To expect him to do so would be to reject history, deny reason and hug an insane and dangerous delusion. I would as soon install a burglar to guard my valuables as I would permit any man, no matter whether a monarch, aristocrat, officer or loafer, who had been a spy to enter into my social or domestic relationships.

Of course the answer will be attempted that spying is absolutely necessary and that others do it, and we are compelled to follow suit. Quite so. But this

answer fully proves my argument. It proves that the basest morality degrades all higher moralities to its own level. It also proves the deplorable fact that this lower morality has already degraded our own morality. 'Morality is low, alas! Let us degrade ours to the same level!' Which is to say: 'Thieving exists, alas! do not raise the thief; let us all thieve!' You will observe that no diplomat has yet pointed out that a better result would be to raise the lower morality.

It is easier, and probably more enjoyable and lucrative, to thieve with the convicted thief than to educate him above the crime; but it is the essence of mean cowardice, an insult to humanity, and treason to man's only unique endowment of reason.

I make neither claim nor pretence to be of superior morality than the average of my friends and fellow-citizens; but I do claim that this morality is more supervised, protected from infringement, and inflexibly exercised under the guidance of, and submission to, reason alone.

This is not a personal inflated estimate. If anybody will carry out the same method, they will find, as I have, that others will do the estimating for them. They will be regarded as eccentric, and unsociable, and get used to innumerable indications showing that friends and acquaintances admit your good intentions, but that it is just these good intentions which call up involuntarily similar feelings to those with which they greet the tax-collector, or watch the inspector go down to the cellar to read the gas or electric meter.

You are a first-rate fellow, but they DO wish you did not always insist upon reading the little dials upon their character meters! Another amusing feature about these people is, that although they do not consider your eccentricity so bad if you examine the meters of small men and little matters, they raise their hands in horror whenever you proceed to 'tick off and note in your official book' the thousands, hundreds and 'GOOD GRACIOUS! EVEN THE UNITS!' indicated on the dials of

the meters of prominent persons, aristocrats or any member of a class which used to claim deference.

I derive constant delight from these little episodes. As the correct reading of the meter in question is noted, their countenances take on the curious expression you would expect to see had they observed you in a cathedral, clattering up the chancel steps, and round the altar, wearing knickerbockers and hobnailed boots, and carrying a bag of golf clubs !

I am not going to sink my standard to that of diplomacy. And I am not going to be a coward and betray my standard whenever I measure the actions of those in authority or diplomatic positions. If my standard of morality is just towards a beggar, it is equally just towards a monarch or diplomat. I shall maintain it at the one level, and did I offer any excuse, at any time, it would be all on the side of the beggar.

Therefore, with this moderate, but rigid, measure (not elastic, to get out of the way of bullies, or backboneless, so as to collapse for political or social autocrats), we will judge a few historical cases.

There is the incident where Bismarck by his own act brought about the war between France and Germany in 1870. It is known as 'the alteration of the Ems telegram,' and is thus described by Bismarck himself. He mentions that the grandfather of the present Kaiser wished, if possible, to avoid a war with France, but that he himself had threatened to resign if there was no war ; and then continues :

'Having decided to resign in spite of the remonstrances which Roon made against it, I invited him and Moltke to dine with me alone. . . . During our conversation I was informed that a telegram from Ems . . . was being deciphered. When the copy was handed to me it showed that Abeken had drawn up and signed the telegram at His Majesty's command, and I read it out to my guests, whose dejection was so great that they turned away from food and drink. . . . I put a few questions to Moltke as to the extent of our preparations. . . . He answered that if there was to be war

he expected no advantage to us by deferring the outbreak. . . . I made use of the royal authorisation communicated to me through Abeken, to publish the contents of the telegram, and, in the presence of my two guests, I reduced the telegram by striking out words, but without adding or altering. . . . After I had read out the concentrated edition. . . . Moltke remarked: "Now it has a different ring; it sounded before like a parley; now it is like a flourish in answer to a challenge." I went on to explain: "If I at once communicate the text . . . not only to the newspapers, but also by telegraph to all our Embassies, it will be known in Paris before midnight, and . . . will have the effect of a red rag upon the Gallic bull.' *

The following legal definition is interesting in this connection:—

'. . . the false or fraudulent making or alteration of any writing, which purports on the face of it to be good and valid for the purposes for which it was created, to the prejudice of another man's right, in other words, with a design or intent to defraud.'

This is the definition of the crime of forgery. I therefore directly charge Bismarck with the crime of forgery, and his two friends, Roon and Moltke, with being accessories before the act. Bismarck himself, with a cynical pride, pleads guilty to the crime of forgery. Apologetic historians describe the incident as 'the alteration of the Ems telegram.' This is nothing but cowardice, and the prostitution of justice and reason. Has Bismarck ever previously been publicly charged with being a forger? I hope so, but I have not yet personally come across such an honest statement. It is impossible for any self-respecting man to attempt to dodge this conclusion. Here was a man of strong character, who ought to have been able to do his life's work with clean hands and his commanding intellect, yet he stoops to the employment of common forgery! There was no shred of excuse. Cynical outrages on morality, the consequent atrocities of the murders and

* *Bismarck, his Reflections and Reminiscences.*

miseries of war, and the prospect of gain for his own aggrandisement or the wreaking of national passions or lust of conquest, are not excuses but additional accusations.

If there are to be degrees of forgery, Bismarck's was of the blackest variety.

In Galsworthy's fine educational play, *Justice*, which I strongly advise everybody to see, or at least read, a young clerk, with the cleanest of motives, alters a cheque with the intention of providing money as a means of escape for a respectable married woman, whose life is rendered a misery by a brutal and dissolute husband. The man was prompted by motives which, compared with those of Bismarck, seem almost angelic. Yet justice tracked him down, disgraced him, and condemned him, for this one simple lapse from rectitude, to a brutal punishment, which not only callously refused to consider his youth, his temptation and his excessive goodness, which led to his badness, but, like our penal system in general, was diabolically calculated to crush every good feeling or motive out of him, and transmute him into a warped, hopeless and revengeful brute.

No cowardly apologist hypocritically whined that he 'altered a cheque'! No blackguardly code of diplomacy threw its cloak of saintly purity over his attempt to get a few pounds, not for himself but simply to give, in charity, assistance which he was too poor, though anxious, to afford out of his own means, and which neither public philanthropy nor social justice has yet attained a strong enough constitution to bestow.

Why are there two such standards? Why is an unselfish, though illegal, impulse sufficient to damn one man for ever, while a cynical and calculated forgery—not filching a few sovereigns, but robbing thousands of life and condemning more thousands of the loved relations, whom they guarded, to grief and poverty—is expiated by the wagging of a few empty heads and only the blasphemous remark that 'perhaps it was not cricket'?

This incident is a revolting monument to our moral

hypocrisy, and it deserves it. Bismarck has inscribed his own name with those of Jim the Penman and other unprincipled members of the criminal fraternity into which he so glibly describes his initiation.

To take another and present-day illustration. There is enough and conclusive evidence that the members of the Austrian and German diplomatic services who were responsible for the incidents are guilty of the crime of fraudulent conspiracy.

To mention the confirmatory evidence first, we must remember the proved attempt of the Austrian and German Ministers to commit Italy and embroil her in the war, while plotting to hide any knowledge of these attempts from the Italian Ambassador [1]; the selection of a time when the French Government and Ministers were at sea and beyond consultation or communication with their own country [2]; the choice of a period of leave of absence from Vienna of the Russian Ambassador [3]; the delay of seventeen hours out of the maximum forty-eight before communicating the Austrian ultimatum to the Russian Government [4]; the suppression of the publication in Germany of the Serbian reply [5]; the absence of the Austrian Minister so that fatal delay was purposely caused.[6]

These alone afford extremely strong presumptive evidence, but conclusive evidence of guilt is provided by the illegal act of wilfully delaying, or suppressing, telegrams accepted for transmission and for which the fees had been received as in ordinary business transactions. The telegram to the French Foreign Office from Belgrade on 27th July was wilfully delayed for twenty hours,[7] and the reverse telegram, accepted as of special urgency, and after payment of the special rates, was delayed for seven hours by the Austrian telegraph authorities.[8] The telegram dispatched from Berlin by Sir Edward Goschen to Sir Edward Grey, accepted in the ordinary course on the evening of 4th August, was entirely suppressed.[9]

See references in Section II. [1] 1. [2] 3. [3] 1. [4] 4. [5] 5. [6] 6. [7] 6. [8] 6. [9] 2.

These illegal acts in delaying or suppressing dispatches and telegrams would compel a conviction for fraudulent conspiracy in any court of law, even although, unfortunately, this is not always a synonymous term with a court of justice.

If some impecunious individual succumbs to temptation, and endeavours to obtain a few shillings dishonestly from some betting-man by antedating a telegram, or even by delaying its delivery for a few minutes, with hypocritical righteousness we raise a howl of fraudulent conspiracy, our police pounce upon the unfortunate petty swindler, haul him before a magistrate, secure various remands in custody, chase him through an assize trial, denounce him as a dangerous criminal, and send him to as long a term of punishment as our indignant feelings can prevail upon the judge to award as an expiation for our outraged morality.

Then we turn the pages of Government White Papers and read, with an amused snigger, how high-placed swindlers diplomatically and fraudulently conspired to carry through a similar, but immeasurably more atrocious, crime where their own stakes were nil, and the ill-got gains were paid in millions of lives and hundreds of millions of money. We explain to the betting-man that it is solely because of our injured innocence that we prosecute, as his own calling is illegal and really deprives him of any legal protection ; and at the same time we throttle our self-respect, repudiate our morality, and with servile smirk kow-tow to the flummeries and aristocratic swindlers, dressed in any Court costume !

The whole business is nauseating. The marvel is that we preserve either the self-respect necessary to make life worth living, or the atrocious cheek to regard ourselves as paragons of morality. How low it is possible to sink, and how fatal is the contamination suffered from this moral vengeance on the weak, and criminal servility under the strong, is proved and demonstrated by the excuses made upon all sides in

regard to that meanest of all professions—namely, that of the spy.

If our soldiers are to be admired because they take their lives in their hands and stake, and too often lose, them in the illusory search for a false glory, some respect can be maintained for the professed criminal who knowingly risks his character and his liberty in his pursuit of dangerous and illegal undertakings. But the man who can cheat and betray, under the guise of friendship, common citizenship, or business relationship, any fellow-man who still possesses sufficient trust in human natrue not to suspect his trickery, ought, by even an attenuated morality, to be held as placing himself beyond all claims to consideration and even beneath contempt.

Perhaps the clearest proof of the moral plague of diplomacy is furnished by the fact that men can be found who will offer excuses for, or even defend, this most despicable crime of spying. It is a depth of iniquity which cannot be paralleled in any level of the animal creation. The beasts of prey may stalk their quarry. They risk success on straightforward physical attributes. The spy never attains this moral altitude. The fact that he risks his life may show either what we call animal courage or recklessness; but no other animal makes a conscious attempt to allay suspicion while he seduces his victims. This ultimate depth can only be attained by man through the prostitution of his one supreme gift of reason, in order to conceive a depth of meanness not otherwise existing in nature.

I am told that it is a recognised and necessary corollary of diplomacy. I reply that if this is advanced, it damns diplomacy as completely as I could desire, or morality demand.

Yet such is the blasting influence of this dual morality that many people are more willing to debauch their morality than to exterminate the poisonous infection.

Were I not fortified by an unshakable faith in the eventual triumph of evolution, which is as much mental and moral as physical, I should be glad of a chance of

severing my connection with existing humanity. There is as much, but no more, to admire in the acknowledged despot as in the highwayman. Each lives by robbery, each plays a similar dirty game, but openly, and risking his own life every time he may happen to meet a man whose courage causes him to resist.

But the spy is not even up to the level of the pickpocket, who sneaks amongst a crowd and thieves by his cunning. Of course he runs a risk, just like the spy, IF FOUND OUT, so that here they are equal. But the spy is more despicable, because while by cunning he sneakishly picks the pockets of your brain, he adds the despicable crime of lying, the mean fraud of pretended, but false, friendship, treachery of whatever trust he can defraud his victim into extending to him, and the utter betrayal of all hospitality or business relationships.

War is the throwing back of the human race to the former level now represented by lions, tigers, hyenas, and other beasts far below the respectable ancestral ape ; but spying is the immeasurably deeper reversal to the level of vermin, and is such a degraded manifestation amid humanity that each honest individual should insist upon the absolute and ruthless extermination of every single specimen.

Any plea that many excellent men have been spies only intensifies the demand for extermination, in that it proves that the plague may be carried amidst and infect our best material. Any individual verminous animal is none the less verminous because it possesses some excrescence characteristic of a species tabulated as military, naval, aristocratic or monarchical varieties.

If the democracies only knew, AND WOULD HONESTLY THINK ABOUT the immorality of spying, I am sure that their superior sense of reason and justice would rise in indignation, and sweep away this awful disgrace to humanity.

This degraded morality has been cultivated by the Prussian military caste until it is now the principal

doctrine of their degraded religion. I ask each member of the various democracies to note the following ideals, principles, rules and acts which are embraced within the beliefs and works of spying.

It is called 'secret service' according to diplomatic duplicity. This does not affect its true estimate, but is only evidence of the same moral cowardice which attempts to suborn the morality of all honest men by describing a lie as a terminological inexactitude. Another phase of the danger of false thinking is here disclosed. It is easy to influence judgment, or even to cheat justice, by careful selection of the term used to describe a crime. This is due to the lamentable fact that the almost universal mental laziness deals only with phases, and does not trouble to regard the REALITY BEHIND each phase. This practice is as disastrous to morality as it would be in finance blindly to accept as legal tender any and every piece of paper which was offered, without regard to the character of the payer or any question as to whether there was any possibility of gold being ultimately available to fulfil the obligation.

Apologists for spying declare that it is necessary, and the democracies accept the security without inquiring what is included under or constitutes the spying. Did they insist upon learning what they really buy with their secret service money under the name of spying, I am sure that every single democracy would emphatically declare that there could be no possible necessity for so foul a production; that true necessity has never existed; that any suggestion of necessity must cease HERE AND NOW; that any future attempt to excuse is merely an insulting accusation of democratic morality; and that spying shall be immediately cast on to the dung-heap with all other moral corruption.

As I have already stated, the moral disease is most carefully cultivated in Prussia, but I most solemnly call the attention of every honest man in the British democracy to the fact that our own Government has within the present month (February 1915) TREBLED

THE AMOUNT OF SECRET SERVICE MONEY taken from OUR subscriptions, to purchase, IN OUR NAME, a threefold addition of moral leprosy.

I will therefore give a few examples of the various contaminating purchases, made from day to day by Prussia, and then ask each democratic reader to state clearly, and with honest courage, whether he will silently accept his share of the responsibility thus thrust upon him, this new insult which, unless repudiated and denounced, will convict our national morality of hypocrisy, and our personal honour of being only a despicable fraud.

I do not believe that the mass of the German nation would approve of such moral debasement any more than the mass of the British nation; so I shall allude to spying as Prussian, because it is an integral part of that vile scourge of Prussian militarism.

I hope that the democracies will be surprised to learn that it is not only in the giving of alms that observance must be paid to the rule: 'Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.'

Our National Executives are more or less conscientiously trying with their right hands to deal out justice and material benefits to their respective fellow-subjects. But they have plunged their left hands to varying depths in the most loathsome cesspool of iniquity, hidden under the term spying, cloaked with the disguise of secret service, and fraudulently represented as a recognised and necessary minor department of diplomacy.

The crimes which are most revolting to our consciences when committed within our own national social orbits are committed, encouraged and paid for at our expense, and ostensibly upon our behalf and with our consent, by means of this despicable subterfuge.

Every nation has its left hand fouled by proxy of the secret diplomacy. Some have only dabbled their fingers, while the Prussian has thrust his whole arm up to the shoulder, as deep as possible into the seething corruption so as to be able to stir up even the foulest

dregs. Unless the British democracy at once take a firm stand in defence of their honour, the new trebling of our investment in this direction will plunge our arm at any rate as far as the elbow, and if we connive at this proceeding, we forfeit any honest claim to true national morality, and by harnessing with, at present, a respectable social morality, we shall not elevate the lower, but merely debase the higher force. The word 'hypocrisy' is shamed in our eyes when we recognise that although the German Government joined in the Convention for suppressing the White Slave Traffic, the Prussian diplomats actually provide and maintain many establishments themselves, where they install female spies, a brand highly appreciated for their efficiency and popularity. From the multiplicity of pretentious fashionable houses in the Dorotheen Strasse, adjoining Unter den Linden, in Berlin, right through all the grades of society to the canteens and the pitfalls for sailors, this army of Imperial prostitutes conducts its diplomatic activities. Although the German nation does not recognise the fact, still the inscription over their Imperial Secret Service Bureau embraces the unexpressed sub-title: 'and Purveyor of Prostitutes to all classes. Branch Establishments in all quarters of the Empire, and in all the Principal Foreign Countries.'

Much illuminating evidence is given in a book entitled *The German Spy System in France*, by Paul Lanoir. I acknowledge my indebtedness to this source. The author has drawn upon a wide literature, as well as upon personal experience, for his evidence; and his book constitutes an amazing history of Prussian Secret Service from 1848 to 1908.

Let us beware lest such a revolting history could be written about the English Secret Service at any time after February 1915.

The low pitch of the keynote of the whole performance can be gauged from the account of the appointment of the arch-spy, Stieber, in the Royal Palace itself by King Frederick William IV. personally engaging him as his Polizeirath, with orders to insinuate himself

into the neighbourhood of the person of Prince Louis Napoleon, then President of the French Republic, and to contrive, through the intermediary of some person, man or woman—the Baroness de X., if necessary—to keep the Prussian Government informed of every action, gesture, or intention of the Prince President and the members of his immediate entourage, down to the smallest detail.

'At the foot of his letter of appointment, which the President of the Royal Ministry of State read over to Stieber, the King added, "The position of Director of Public Safety at Berlin is vacant. I reserve it for him as a reward for his zeal and devotion, on which I confidently rely—(signed) F. W. R. [FREDERICK WILLIAM, REX]."

'At No. 1, a house now officially controlled by Stieber, is Kaula, "the most subtle and skilful of female spies." In February 1875 she left Berlin entrusted with the task, which she well fulfilled, of going to France and "contriving to enter into relations," not with staff officers, in whom a minister may not always entirely confide, but with the Minister of War himself.' [10]

After several years of devilment, Stieber suffered a temporary eclipse owing to a successful revolt in the Reichstag against such foul morality. Will other democracies please note? The German people themselves revolted, and scored a temporary success, but the unprincipled assassins of morality who had gathered the power into their own hands were able to hedge them off, and deprive them of the power of cleansing their own house of this pestilence through the secrecy with which they work, and the thoughtless imbecility of the nation which permits them to do it. British Secret Service money has just been trebled—*verb. sap.*

But in March 1864 Stieber obtained an introduction to Bismarck. As we have already recognised, Bismarck was not likely to be deterred by any weakness of morality; and he was the paymaster who wrung the price of crime from the people, and Stieber, as the active

[10] Lanoir, p. 4.

and cunning king-rat, converted spying into a perverted science and a blackguardly art.

How would my fellow-citizens appreciate the position of shareholder in a firm which received and executed orders from its foreign representatives as did Bismarck and Stieber on the receipt of a signed order from their agent, Zerniki, in France, about the year 1867?

In forwarding his list of necessaries for use in fourteen departments of France, this man ordered these two universal providers to send him all the goods mentioned on the following amazingly long and comprehensive list. It must have given Bismarck and Stieber a busy season and made them earn their salary at least during their necessary overtime.

'(1) Between four and five thousand farmers, market gardeners, agricultural labourers and vine-growers, for whom the spies "at fixed posts" undertook to find employment in their respective callings within the sphere of action of the spies concerned. A certain number of these reports declared that "Prussian agricultural labourers would be very well received in France, where they bear the reputation of being active and obedient," but that "great prudence must be exercised in sending them"; they should arrive "one by one" or at most "two at a time."

'(2) From seven to nine thousand female domestics, preferably widows or unmarried women, for employment in the cafés, restaurants, beer halls, and hotels.

'Zerniki gave six or seven hundred as the number of men, retired non-commissioned officers possessing a "small primary education," for whom, as stated in their reports, his agents undertook to find places in French commercial or industrial offices. These, it must be understood, were to be entirely additional to the commercial travellers and travelling agents (in espionage), frankly avowing themselves natives of Prussia, Luxemburg, Saxony, or Baden, who visited the spies "at fixed posts" under cover of their nominal professions, and who were not to be interfered with.

'This same Zerniki put forward in his report of

"conclusions arrived at" an emphatic demand for forty-six "young and pretty" Prussian women, who were required by his local agents as maidservants in the canteens of the garrison in the East. Zerniki also added "by choosing them carefully we shall provide ourselves with valuable informers, and we can arrange for them to be visited from time to time by some of their near relations."'

The degree of relationship was of the sort which a female spy at a fixed post bears to a travelling controller or to a district inspector.

'His spies likewise asked him for two hundred other female domestics, which they said ought certainly to be placed amongst the middle-class society, the lawyers, doctors, magistrates, etc., in whose houses German maids were in great demand, because "whilst attending to the work of the household and taking care of the children, they acted at the time as elementary German teachers to the children of these gentlemen, who were not generally persons of large means."

'Without, therefore, going beyond these official figures, we must estimate at between 12,500 and 13,000, the number of emissaries of the police, of both sexes, with whom the spies already established at fixed posts insisted on being surrounded.' [11]

An order like that ought to have kept Bismarck and Stieber busy for some time. Writing out the detailed invoice would be a long business in itself.

Do not let anybody think that such State-instigated and State-provided immorality can run parallel with a high state of social or private morality. If you wink at, or encourage a man in State service to pilfer the Treasury, do you imagine that it would be safe to appoint him treasurer of any bank or company ?

The amazing degradation of morality which follows in those responsible for this Secret Service, is proved by a question and answer in the Reichstag, by Mr Richter, a deputy, and the leader of the Opposition, 'on the more than doubtful morality of the individuals

[11] Lanoir, pp. 25-27.

employed by Councillor Rumpff for the services of his police.'

He criticised and exposed in the Chamber, amongst other charges, the following :—

(1) Recruiting as secret agents members of Parliament and their wives, Ministers, Court officials, and even the wife of the Prefect of Police himself.

(2) Seeking to entrap persons of prominence connected with politics, commerce, industry, the magistracy, and more particularly foreign embassies, by the use of the houses of Krausse, houses which were specially and exceptionally stocked by this woman, and her subordinates in the provinces, 'for the benefit of these highly placed gentlemen.' [12]

What was the result of this inquiry, and what was the reply ?

The Minister of the Interior, Von Puttkamer, pronounced, from the tribune of the Chamber, the following exact words :—'It is the right and duty of the State to employ extraordinary and special methods, and even if that honest and estimable functionary, Police-councillor Rumpff, has employed the methods of which he is accused, in order to secure for the State the benefits of useful intelligence, I here publicly express to him my satisfaction and thanks.' [13]

This reply was actually endorsed by a vote of the Parliament !

Any man who voted in favour of this did so either because his own morality was no better than the brand provided for consumption by the Prussian Office itself, or because he was too cowardly to refuse to be a traitor to any superior morality.

Von Puttkamer himself is indelibly stamped as an individual whose moral character renders him totally unfit to be placed in charge of either a female penitentiary, a gaol, or a lunatic asylum.

The moral cowardice of society, however, permitted him to remain as a man who was fit to be received, and allowed to converse with, and contaminate all those

[12] Lanoir, p. 6. [13] *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

innocent women and girls with whom he came in contact.

Thus does diplomacy seduce people from morality. Multiply this instance by the whole diplomatically debauched set in Prussia, and to this total add those similarly tainted in other countries, all belonging to the social circle taken as a pattern of manners and behaviour, and then say if this fungus will not introduce decay and rot into the props of national morality.

No poet ever uttered a truer warning than did Pope when he wrote :

> 'Vice is a monster of such hideous mien,
> As to be hated, needs but to be seen ;
> Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
> We first endure,—then pity,—then embrace.'

Is the British democracy, is any democracy, content, now that the danger is pointed out, to permit such a vile focus of corruption to exist for a moment longer ?

A man may say that he is all right, and can take care of himself. Another instance of shallow thinking of which any man ought to be ashamed. We adults are not anxious for ourselves, but are we satisfied with the prospect of our daughters and granddaughters being condemned to pass their lives in an ever-widening circle of this infecting morality ? *

* Note (18th Sept. 1915). The truth of my warning to my fellow-democrats is established by the present political situation. In the newspapers of two days ago (16th Sept. 1915), I read the announcement that our Government had again increased our Secret Service money to a sum which by 31st March 1916 will total an expenditure of £350,000 ! HERE is proof that even in a righteous war for the defence of freedom and small nations, our own country has already attained to about half the degradation of the Prussian, whose infamy we pretend to loathe, and the extermination of which we advertise as our noble ambition ! The Machiavellian plot of a solid and sordid phalanx of conspirators to force conscription upon our nation, even at the risk of disaster and revolution, with their shameless lies that 3,000,000 voluntary enlistments constitute a failure of voluntary recruiting, demonstrate that there is not a depth in Prussian militarism which these men do not covet.

It is almost unnecessary to do more than mention the repeated purchase of the souls of men who would remain honest but for financial temptation devilishly forced upon them at times of difficulty, with the result that they lose everything in position, self-respect, and finally sink to the degradation of traitors.

Also we find labour unrest, strikes and riots, all engineered in other countries by spies and paid for by Prussian gold. This is proved by the famous, or rather infamous, Mesnard pamphlet.

I must point out the unfathomable depth of meanness to which even those who claim to be *Dei gratia* may sink.

They are determined to drag the rest of us down into the degradation desired by that malevolent agency which has already started foretelling another war, and is straining every nerve and outraging every moral restraint to 'get things done' so that this future atrocity may be inevitable.

They know that Prussian militarisation of the British nation is useless for THIS war and that voluntary enlistment has already dangerously depleted our industrial ranks, upon whose efficient maintenance the triumph in this war depends. It is these industrial ranks in Britain which maintain not only the British fighting ranks but also those of all our Allies. Break these by conscription, OR DISLOCATE THEM BY ENGINEERED PROVOCATIONS TO REVOLUTION and all the fighting ranks opposing Prussian militarism automatically collapse. There is a sinister meaning in this yelling to crush Prussian militarism, while at the same time pursuing the double purpose of binding its identical fetters upon the British nation, and hamstringing our forces for crushing it in Europe.

Only two possible motives can actuate these men. (1) They are already preparing a future war to wreck the remains of civilisation, and have neither the reason nor the morals to either work for, or desire, that future human relationships should be lifted above the level of the beasts of prey; or (2) otherwise they must of necessity desire this militarism for use during peace. This proves that they have added to their other base motives that of traitorously waging war upon their fellow-citizens and their own nationality in a despicable struggle to prevent the growth of social legislation and improvement, and to rob the British democracies of their rights, liberties and properties.

Let every man who desires justice and the pure air of freedom for his children recognise this design, and help to overthrow the whole gang of atrocious conspirators.

To explain adequately the following culminating meanness of the Kaiser Wilhelm II., I must convict him of full knowledge of spying previous to the incident I desire to publish for the widest recognition.

In a book published in February 1915,[14] Mr W. le Queux gives a verbatim report of a speech delivered by the Kaiser at a Secret Council in June 1908.

I regret that in this book Mr le Queux undermines his own influence by his evident prejudice. Although constantly stating that he has no politics, and is an entirely non-party man,[15] his tone throughout the whole book makes one wonder what position is left for a violently prejudiced party politician.

When a man puts his whole energy into flinging mud with one hand and butter with the other hand, his judgment must be suspected.

Again, the account of this speech was supplied to Mr le Queux by an intimate friend, who happened to be a high functionary in Germany, and closely associated with the Kaiser. Germany has spies in England ; we too have our friends in Germany.' [16]

As his book is written for the express purpose of denouncing spies, I do not quite appreciate the insinuation that a German spy in England should be the object of loathing and a German traitor in Berlin only an intimate personal friend and a friend of England.

This informant was present at the meeting, and although 'a German of high position, he holds pro-British views, and has in consequence, more than once furnished me with secret information from Berlin which has been of the greatest use to our Intelligence Department.' [17]

Apart from the fact that such a friend would be shot and would fully deserve it, if discovered either in England or Germany, this informant must have a memory which can only be compared to a pantechnicon van. We are told that '. . . at this Secret Council the Kaiser

[14] *German Spies in England*, by William le Queux.
[15] P. 13. [16] P. 22. [17] P. 23.

looked pale, determined, and somewhat nervous and unstrung. For more than two hours he spoke. . . .'[18]

Of course the Kaiser may have been provided with notes, as well as refreshments; but it is unlikely, nor is the idea suggested, that this informant managed to secure the Kaiser's manuscript. Yet the report he forwarded reported the speech 'more fully than I can here reproduce it.'[19]

As Mr le Queux does reproduce it, the speech, given as a verbatim report, occupies eleven pages of his book! One can only admire either the memory or the imagination of his informant.

However, it is very interesting, and as the Kaiser is not the sort of man to overlook anything done upon his behalf at an annual cost of £780,000, we may take it as certain that he knows about the elaborate and highly organised system of Prussian spying. In this interesting speech he is reported to have said: 'You will desire to know how the outbreak of hostilities will be brought about. I can assure you on this point. Certainly we shall not have to go far to find a just cause for war. My army of spies scattered over Great Britain and France, as it is over North and South America, as well as all the other parts of the world, where German interests may come to a clash with a foreign power, will take good care of that. I have issued already some time since secret orders that will, at the proper moment, accomplish what we desire.'[20]

My object in especially alluding to the Kaiser in connection with spying is not connected with this secret speech, however, but to make known as widely as possible a fact which proves the depths of meanness to which a man, even in his position, can sink under the malign influences of militarism and the kind of diplomacy which must ever be its partner. I have already alluded to his army of spies scattered over France, but I want to notice his army of spies scattered over Great Britain.

There can be no doubt that for some years the Prussians have honeycombed England with an immense

[18] P. 23. [19] P. 22. [20] P. 30.

army of these despicable individuals of their own nationality, and as several prosecutions have unfortunately proved, with a considerable number of recruits of our own fellow-countrymen purchased as traitors from the basest material in all ranks of society. Over this army of vermin, employed in undermining the vital supports of our Empire, a certain Prime-Minister-rat was appointed, known as Herr Georg Steinhauer. This man received reports from the 'army of spies in Great Britain.' That is his especial appointment, and he directs their activities.

The curious incident to which I desire to call attention is the following :—In the year 1911, the Kaiser came to England to attend the ceremony of the unveiling of the Queen Victoria Memorial. He stayed at Buckingham Palace as the guest of King George. He appointed Steinhauer as one of his suite, and this man also stayed as a guest at the Palace, and was introduced to the King by the Kaiser. Steinhauer, while still swindling the King and Court into thinking that he was an honest man, because of his introduction by an equally dishonest man, employed some of his time visiting his subsidiary vermin in London and little hostelries in seaport towns. He collected reports on behalf of his traitorous employer, each of which was in furtherance of their scheme to ruin their host, and he returned to Buckingham Palace and laid them before his master, the Kaiser. During this visit the Kaiser made a speech in which he stated that there was no political significance in his visit, but that it would 'draw our peoples together, and strengthen the bonds of friendship between the English and German nations' ! When leaving, the Kaiser said that he had been delighted with his stay.

Now here was a man—I had almost made the mistake of writing the word 'gentleman'—who came as an honoured guest of his cousin, the King of England, stayed at Buckingham Palace, declared that his only object was to cement friendship, while for years he had maintained an army of spies and traitors throughout the whole country with the express purpose of destroying

the British Empire, degrading the British people, and dethroning, or what is worse, making a vassal of, his host, our King, and his own cousin.

He had the amazing impudence to smuggle Steinhauer into the Palace, and into the friendship of the man and society whose downfall he had for years been plotting, and all the time the real object of the Kaiser-rat and his Prime-Minister-rat was to secure reports about, and encourage more strenuous exertions from, the lesser rats who worked their will in his sewer-scheme of traitorous spying!

Lying has never been more perfectly impersonated; no traitor has ever achieved a fouler triumph, and the most despicable character has never plumbed a greater depth of meanness.

I had thought that our own authorities could not have been ignorant of the atrocious criminality of these two men, and I was revolted by the cowardice which restrained them from calling upon the lustiest porter in the Palace to kick the two of them down the back stairs and out of the Palace along with the ordinary garbage. But Mr le Queux states: 'At this time of course, Steinhauer's real mission was unknown to our Home Office, and, of course, Steinhauer is not his real name. It was not until later in the year that the Confidential Department fixed his identity and ascertained his true character.' [21]

While this statement is an immense relief to me, and prevents the annihilation of my respect for these authorities, I am troubled with a lurking suspicion that, even had they known, diplomacy would have made them such feeble moral cowards that they would have shrunk from this—the least possible—method of expressing our national hatred of such absolute barrenness of every trace of honesty or morality.

Plain justice would have strung the two of them up to the handiest lamp-post, and this could have erred only on the side of mercy.

That I am, unfortunately, only too correct in my

[21] P. 105.

estimate of the disastrous effects of the moral cowardice which bullies national crime, yet licks the boots of diplomatic crime of greater intensity, is substantiated by the following sequence of events.

Mr le Queux tells us : 'The only organ of the Press which recognised the spy-peril in its earliest stages was *The Daily Mail*, which never ceased to point out the imminent danger, and to warn the public that Germany meant us harm. Because of this open policy, it was from time to time denounced by the deluded public—deluded because of official lies—for what was termed its scaremongerings.[22]

We are assured that *The Daily Mail* was such a sleuth-hound for spies. and that the identity of Steinhauer was known towards the end of 1911. Also that it never ceased to print repeated warnings in editorials and articles which convinced it so firmly of its own unique prophetic vision that it reprinted them as a home-made testimonial to its own virtues, and a heaven-made opportunity of slanging its journalistic rivals.

'. . . I would recommend those who would harbour a belief in the benevolence of German policy to read a book called *The German Spy System in France*. . . . Mr Lanoir tells us that in 1870 there were 36,000 spies in France. Each of these men was an agent in advance for the German armies. How many foreigners are there in this country to-day, and are none of them German spies ? In the event of war German spies and agents resident in England might attack our arsenals, our railways, our harbours, our telegraphs. . . . If the spy-scare is baseless, on what do the German Government spend more than three-quarters of a million of secret service money annually ? '[23]

I consider that this fawning moral cowardice is demonstrated in the following extract from *The Evening News* (*The Daily Mail* evening issue), as late as 17th October 1913 :—

'We all acknowledge the Kaiser as a very gallant gentleman, whose word is better than many another's

[22] P. 44. [23] 'Scaremongerings,' date 25/11/10.

bond, a guest whom we are always glad to welcome and sorry to lose. A ruler whose ambitions for his own people are founded on as good right as our own.'

Now, this illustrates the terrible danger in the almost universal fault of sloppy thinking for ourselves, and permitting any man who can grind out miles of paper covered with a printed mixture of scare-lines, horticultural competitions and advertisements, to mould, represent or misrepresent popular opinion.

Either *The Daily Mail* staff never read the melodramatic warnings supplied by its stormy petrels, and its own anti-pacification leading articles, carefully maintaining a primitive innocence in regard to spying in general, and the Kaiser and Steinhauer in particular, or it knew about the German spy system which it had, so to speak, semaphored with its best typed scare-heads, and its beautiful patriotism was of that brand which longed to invite a traitorous relative of our monarch to come early and often and repeat his disgusting treachery.

In plain words, this quotation of 17th October 1913 can have no possible explanation except either ignorance or sycophantic moral cowardice; and in neither case are we surprised.

I should like here to call attention to an instance of how public opinion is defrauded by what is really criminal juggling with books, etc., previous to publication.

It is in connection with that curious chameleon-spy, Dr Armgaard Carl Graves, and the book he wrote upon the German Spy System, which has enjoyed a wide circulation both here and in America.

Mr le Queux writes:—'Graves was sentenced on July 23rd, 1912. On June 7th, 1913, came the amazing announcement that he had been released. When, and why he was set at liberty, no one outside official circles knows; all the information given was that "Graves was released in due course of law, but there is no further information to give." Graves's own story was that he was released in order that he might join the British Secret Service, but this fact, and even the fact that he had been released, came to us from America.

The sensational story of his release and subsequent adventures was published by *The New York American* in the following narrative :—

'"Armgaard Carl Graves, former secret agent in the German service, who was convicted of espionage in England last July and sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment, declares that shortly after his sentence he was released in order to join the British Secret Service.

'"He was sent to America, and there discovered that envoys of Germany and Japan had met in New York with the object of completing an anti-American agreement. He succeeded in making a copy of the document and cabling it to the British Foreign Office.

'"He never got any payment from England, however, so has decided to make the contents public. The agreement binds Germany not to interfere in a great Japanese scheme of colonisation in the South Sea."

'Graves afterwards published a book in which he professed to give away many of the secrets of the German spy system. Information we have received from other sources shows that a great deal of the book is well founded, and it may well be that on the whole, it is a fairly reliable exposure of German methods. But the last thing one should do is to trust or believe a spy!'[24]

Please to remember this last sentence carefully, as I shall have to refer to it again shortly. At present I desire to call particular attention to the fact that the English edition of this book is a grossly doctored production. Names of British statesmen have been suppressed, and three entire pages cut out, and the whole meaning falsified by what is really a forgery perpetrated upon the author.

I quote from an article giving contrasts of the American with the English edition : 'Now comes a deliberate perversion of what Dr Graves wrote in his original edition. In the London edition, Chapter VIII. ends with the words :—

'Even I cannot reveal the substance of these

[24] Pp. 166-167.

documents. But the result of that meeting was to preserve the peace of the Great European Powers during the Balkan War."

'As a matter of fact Dr Graves in his book (original edition, published, remember, about a month before the London edition), did not say that at all. He said the exact opposite of that. So far from saying that he could not reveal the substance of these documents, HE ACTUALLY SPENDS THREE-AND-A-HALF PAGES IN REVEALING IT; so far from saying, "Even I cannot reveal it," he says:

'"What I shall do now is to reveal the substance of these documents, coupling them with overheard conversations, thus interpreting the full significance of the conference."' [25]

In the three pages excised, and the omission of which is hidden by this falsification, Dr Graves narrates a discussion, between the English, German and Austrian representatives, at a secret conference, of Germany's desire for ports by annexing Holland and Belgium, and by Austria of ports on the Mediterranean, and states that it was ports from which to send her manufactures which Germany desired, and that she had no ambition for colonies. The writer of the criticism and contrast of the two editions ends by wondering who was responsible for the doctoring, so as to represent England as blameless and Germany the only culprit? I myself have been informed who was primarily responsible, but I would like to know under whose authority the alterations were made. I do not express any opinion, as it is not material to my argument, which is simply to establish the fact that the British public is befooled and misled even when books are issued ostensibly with honesty.

The whole business of spying is to be as near perfection as possible as a liar, in thought, word and deed; and to make every attempt to degrade others as near as possible to your own infernal level. The spy who is most conscientious towards his own country or master

[25] 'Glasgow Forward,' 7/11/14.

is still a traitor to every suggestion of morality, and to the whole human race, with the exception of his own national group; while the individual who spies against his own country adds this last group, and is a traitor to the entire human race, and to his own claim to any higher evolution than other vermin.

Human nature is still shockingly developed. This is greatly the fault of what we call education. True education should give its first and essential work to the highest development of personal character. A child who has been taught, and has learned, to develop and prize his own true self-respect, is more truly educated than a senior wrangler whose character has not been so formed that his self-respect has attained to its proper level as his unshakable centre of gravity, which maintains its poise throughout every movement and defies every disturbing force.

This fatal defect in our training of children has passed on to us, and is passing on to succeeding generations, an unstable moral equilibrium, which is really at the bottom of all our present social injustices and abuses, intemperance, crime, and most of our lunacy.

It is really a pernicious system, by which a premium is given to every influence which can make for evil and a fatal handicap upon every effort for good.

It is this terrible mistake which renders people susceptible to temptation, and it penetrates every class of society.

Were the true ideal policy observed as the essential and universal basis of education, Diogenes would have had a more hopeless task to find a traitor, and 'honest man' would have been synonymous with 'living man.' Spying would have been as impossible a suggestion as perpetual motion.

But what do we find to-day as the fruit of our false agriculture?

'Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice!' To pass over our statistics of crime and lunacy, and all other extra-political immorality, what a degrading sight is presented by the following:—Mr Lanoir reports that at

one of the German-bribed strikes he met a very distinguished personage connected with German administration, who addressed him in these words :—

'Ah ! if you only knew how many of your politicians who shout and declaim in France, demanding suppression of YOUR secret service funds—if you only knew how many of these men are drawing thumping good salaries out of OUR secret service funds ! If only you knew what proportion of their election expenses is paid by us every four years ! '[26]

Revolting as such an account is, it is no use denying that it contains a good deal of truth. We all of us know enough of the shady tactics of politics to be forced to admit that there is unfortunately no strain involved in believing every word of it, and also in tracing the lines indicated right through political and social life in all countries.

Is it Utopian to hope that humanity may at last trim the lamp of reason and banish the existing darkness and the crawling creatures which shun the light ?

The degraded morals inculcated by spying do not only affect the characters of those actually engaged in the spying itself, but must necessarily extend to all those ramifications of official society whose actions conduce in any way to the assistance of spying, to the hiding of its activities, to the providing of material for its carrying on, or the reception and guarding of its secrets.

As an instance I would point out that the Prussian Foreign Office fully merits the title of a den of thieves, and mean thieves too.

They have been convicted upon as good evidence as ever sent a non-diplomatic thief to penal servitude. Here is a case which defies denial or excuse. An American citizen, Mr Charles A. Inglis, left his passport at the American Embassy in Berlin for registration with the German Foreign Office. The Embassy sent it for registration, but IT WAS NEVER RETURNED. The explanation given by the German Foreign Office to the

[26] P. 42.

American Embassy was that the passport had been mislaid. This identical passport was found in the possession of Carl Lody, a Prussian spy, when he was arrested in Great Britain![27]

It is stated that two hundred United States and British passports have been lost in Germany in the same way, and these are now passing off more spies as they go about their infernal work.

There is no getting round Lody's possession of the passport of Mr Inglis. It was as plain a case of theft by the Prussian Foreign Office as could have occurred had any reader taken his watch to some jeweller for repairs, and then been put off with the explanation that it could not be found, only to discover later on that one of the shop staff had been, and was still, wearing it. It would be recognised as plain theft in the latter case, and punished as such. It is not altered in any way for the better, but for the worse, by the fact that the thieves wore gold lace and stuck over their place of business a legend notifying that it was the German Foreign Office and surmounted by a picture of an impossible eagle.

Many people consider that they mitigate any natural disgrace in regard to spying by advancing the statement that many good men have been spies. Even Mr le Queux, in his recent book, lacks the courage to be just. He throws away his standard when he approaches the name of a spy whose reputation is established.

He mentions Catinat, Ashby and General Nathaniel Lyon, who had acted as spies, and then goes on to say: 'Against the personal honour of such men as these no word can be said, and, as Mr Spaight points out, it is surprising to find a military historian like Sir Henry Hozier declaring that "spies have a dangerous task, and not an honourable one."'[28]

Mr le Queux is quite wrong. It is not Sir Henry Hozier who is at fault.

I would like at this point to allude to the former quotation from Mr le Queux (reference 24), and contrast it with the present one. Mr le Queux here states

[27] Mr le Queux, p. 148. [28] P. 124.

definitely that these men were spies and there states that 'Against the personal honour of such men as these no word can be said.' How does Mr le Queux make this tally with the former dictum: 'But the last thing one should do is to trust or believe the spy'?

It is simply a proof of moral cowardice, which has sufficient courage to accuse when it is thought safe, but cringes, and offers homage should it fear to measure itself against a recognised authority or opponent.

The real surprise is that any man should think that any despicable act is mitigated in the least degree because it is performed by men who have done good work in other directions. Daily we see that one lapse from honesty ruins the careers of many men whose previous characters have been deserving of reward or praise.

If it be just—which I doubt—that the sudden temptation of embezzlement or forgery should blast any man's career, the same justice demands that no more mercy shall be shown to any man who spies. To deny this would be ridiculous. If spying loses its guilt when done by a man otherwise estimable, then also burglary is blameless when carried out by a philanthropist, and the slaying of a fellow-man by an archbishop automatically consecrates murder!

The very fact that such a line of argument is possible proves the unsatisfactory and anæmic condition of the moral sense of society.

The next paragraph in Mr le Queux's book carries this bendable morality even further: 'The truth seems to be that as regards the military spy in time of war, popular opinion stands in need of revision. In the face of the instances quoted, it cannot be fairly said that the military spy is necessarily a man of dishonour. The spy and the revolutionary, in some respects, fall under the same category. If they succeed, well and good; if they fail, they pay the inevitable penalty, and no mercy is shown them. Yet the revolutionary as well as the spy may be a person of blameless honour.' [29]

[29] P. 124.

I agree that the 'popular opinion as regards the military spy' needs revising, along with the popular opinion of other fashionable immoralities. But what sort of mind is it that justifies any crime on the ground that: 'in face of the instances quoted, it cannot be fairly said that the military spy is necessarily a man of dishonour'?

If I collect a list of, say, a score of clergymen who in recent years have been sent to prison for what we all agree is a foul social crime, will Mr le Queux write a plea that 'in face of the instances quoted, it cannot be fairly said that the . . . is necessarily a man of dishonour'?

If he will not promise to do this, I need not trouble to draw up the list; but any refusal to advance the plea in the latter case knocks the bottom out of Mr le Queux's argument and use of it in the former case. The tangled arguments used by apologists often cover the real truth under discussion. I do not criticise Mr le Queux for any other motive than that of desiring to co-operate in showing up the dangers of spying. It is this which forces me to call attention to the crippling effects which subservience to old ideas of custom or prestige produces when permitted either to dull the edge of or deflect incisive reason.

The paragraph just quoted is a good illustration.

'The spy and the revolutionary, in some respects, fall under the same category. . . . Yet the revolutionary as well as the spy may be a person of blameless honour.'

There is absolutely no sequence in the reasoning.

Because these two fall under the same category IN SOME RESPECTS, that does not imply any necessary similarity in their moral merits or demerits. If it did so, then I could advance the argument: 'The lifeboat and the submarine, in some respects, fall under the same category. Yet the submarine as well as the lifeboat may be an invention of beneficent utility'!

Instances of confusion of argument, and elasticity of judgment, like those here advanced by Mr le Queux, are

really dangerous, as they split up the one force of advancing morality into a number of feebler diverging forces, which are easily opposed by apologists who dare not even stand up to the original single force of morality. One of the fallacies is the implication that spy and revolutionary have any necessary similarity of motive.

A spy is always thieving information, even if in what he thinks is a good cause, and at personal danger to himself. He has no other object or excuse for his existence.

A revolutionary MAY be outraging morality also, but, on the other hand, a REVOLUTIONARY MAY be a noble liberator of his fellow-countrymen from the injustice and oppression of some despot or unprincipled gang of political plunderers. Therefore, to couple spies with a revolutionary is to introduce quite unnecessary confusion, and gratuitously demonstrate to your opponent a disastrous breach in your ability to defend your strategic position.

Before leaving the subject of spying, I desire to call attention to a new danger, and one fraught with incalculable possibilities for disaster in the future. The Boy Scout movement is, when divorced from the delusions constituting militarism, the finest educative scheme yet brought forward.

It performs the one and only true principle of education—namely, to draw out the latent mental powers of its pupils.

Hitherto what we have prided ourselves is education, and the method that is followed from the universities down to the infant schools, has sought to smother all the inherent powers of its victims by restricting itself to the process of cramming in cut-and-dried theories and antique history and languages.

The development of observation, deduction and self-reliance, which the Boy Scout movement fostered, promised to inculcate true education, and remove the present almost universal diseased process of sloppy thinking.

The present generation of boys ought to have derived

untold benefit and training, which in future life would have resulted in that keener insight, active interest, and first-hand knowledge of social conditions, human possibilities and aspirations, which would have consolidated a fuller and healthier policy for the betterment of the race.

By the infusion of these improved understandings, the hope of the future was rekindled. But unless each member of the democracies most carefully watches future developments, and courageously and relentlessly scotches any degrading influences, this promised blessing may evolve into a curse.

The more ingenious and efficient any instrument is for good when rightly guided, the more infernally disastrous it is when malevolently used. This truth has been burnt into our brains daily by the appalling ruin consummated by the genius of every science and invention now prostituted for the shambles of war. Let us make sure that the better education of the Boy Scout movement is not now aborted to still further glorify this devilish science.

The originator of this movement rightly received the thanks and enthusiastic adherence of tens of thousands of our rising generations, just at those ages where example is all-powerful.

Within the past few weeks he has published a book narrating his own activities as a spy. There is a real danger that in doing this he has sounded a bugle-call to vice and degradation, which threatens to marshal all these new forces for the cultivation of crime.

The glamour of his name, the enthusiasm for new and interesting activities, will assuredly blind these susceptible young followers to the disgrace of this despicable morality. One of the excellent rules of the movement hitherto has been that 'each Scout should each day do some good action for some other person.' Unless each one of us fully recognises the new danger, the large majority of these promising future helpers will be seduced into somersaulting their morality and adopting as his, or her, new commandment:

'Each day do at least one mean and sneaky trick as a spy.'

I had rejoiced over, and been thankful for the benefits likely to follow from this man's initiation of the new education, but I now regret it. The poisonous germ he has now thrown into it threatens to ferment the entire mixture and convert it from a refreshing draught of nourishing liquid into a maddening stimulant to immorality.

Should this occur, it will be a calamity that he did not meet his deserts during his degraded activities as a spy, thus preventing both the bright promise of his former excellent suggestions, and the far worse consequences of their prostitution to base uses.

I trust that I have carried my readers with me so far that they will agree that spying is a system which is dangerous to morality and degrading to character.

I earnestly hope that I have succeeded sufficiently to enlist their active co-operation in absolutely forbidding this, or any other British Government, from adopting or countenancing spying, in any shape or form, as a part of British policy.

The danger exists—nay, the foul process has already been initiated! Every self-respecting citizen of Great Britain must rise up and veto it. For many years our National Estimates have provided £50,000 per annum for Secret Service. I believe that last year the total was £60,000. But it was with feelings of shame that I saw, in the Civil Service and Revenue Estimates, issued on Saturday, 20th February 1915, that this Secret Service money had been increased to £150,000—an increase of 150 per cent. per annum!

Now we all know the cowardly line of argument which will be urged in excuse. It is the old bankrupt's plea that 'other nations employ spies at enormous cost, and we must necessarily do the same!'

A more cowardly, false, and dangerous statement could not be made. If these men were in any way consistent, they would apply the same falsity of thought

to ordinary crime. Then the judges, juries and people must all become thieves, forgers or murderers, because they cannot prevent others from committing such crimes !

Why do we eternally hear this cowardly doctrine advanced, that if anybody commits a crime, or observes an immoral code of action, there is no higher ambition for others than to equal or excel his degradation or criminality ?

Nobody recognises the danger, or loathes the perpetrator, of spying more than I do, but surely our duty is to prevent and exterminate it, not to add further crime by extensive and intensive cultivation, and debase ourselves to the lowest level we can find in the universe. No self-respecting Briton will permit his nation to be betrayed by spying, nor will he permit his representatives to destroy his honour by performing similar foul deeds in the name of the British nation.

For the purpose of discovering and exterminating spies, I would not grudge one halfpenny of this £150,000, nor of treble the amount, but we should make absolutely certain that not one single halfpenny of the British Revenue money was expended upon the breeding or maintenance of equally despicable criminals in our name.

If there is to be any honour in bearing the name British, it must be that it implies a character or standard of morality and justice of which we can be proud.

If 'British' is to include spying, or any similar degradation, I, for one, should be ashamed to own the title, and shall henceforth maintain that although I am compelled to earn my living amongst them—I am not of them.

As a nation we must ensure, by every possible means, that no other nation shall betray us or our secrets by means of spies. But surely the British Empire is above prying traitorously into the secrets of others. Let us encircle our country with the cleverest rat-catchers procurable ; let us execute swift and full punishment upon every single one of the vermin discovered ; but

in the name of everything honourable, let us not ourselves employ spies, or countenance the slightest attempt at dealing with this unclean thing.

Rather let us buttress truth by meting out to any of our own countrymen discovered spying, at home or abroad, the same certain punishment as we would to those of the imported variety.

Only thus can we escape the just condemnation of being craven cowards in our morality and traitors to every nobility which we, as trustees, are in honour bound to preserve in highest purity, cultivate as our most precious possessions, and pass on as a blessed inheritance to our children, and those who come after us.

Besides the actual crime or immorality which are sheltered under diplomacy, its ideals and manifestations, we find a crowd of false ideals and delusions, all due to the basic fault of either thinking devoid of reason or opinions devoid of thinking.

One of these fallacies is in connection with the quality known as 'patriotism.' This is one of those terms to which each man who uses it attaches that meaning which embodies a portion of his own personality. Unfortunately this conception is almost universally contorted by the absence of any real endeavour to weigh the true merits of the premises from which each man deduces his conclusion as to what patriotism really should embody. With some it is an unreasoning, nebulous sentiment, like a mystic's conception of 'spirit.' With others it is merely a red rag to a pugnacious bull. And again, with many it is a scheme for personal profit or aggrandisement, while with others it implies not self-love, so much as blind foreign hatred.

True patriotism is to the entire human race. Nowadays no country or community can live unto itself alone, any more than in past times any man could live for himself alone. Any attempt for one country to do so is as wrong, under present developments, as it would have been a few centuries ago for one man to be entirely selfishly centred, and hate every neighbour as a foreigner. Yet this mistaken idea controls many men to-day, and

those belonging to the class who pride themselves upon the staunchness of their patriotism.

We therefore find in this class many worshippers of this entirely false ideal included under the word patriotism.

Each man, according to his mental bias, more or less shirks all his thinking and reasoning by the blind adoption of some catchword. He then either shapes his whole conduct by the feeblest observance of its tenets, or becomes an obsessed devotee and pugnaciously bellows threats at anybody else who fails to appreciate and perform some irrational incantation.

Most men follow the former course in regard to their religion. Many men adopt the latter in what they are pleased to regard as patriotism. I have met many otherwise intelligent men whose idea of Weltpolitik is 'my country right or wrong'! It is just on a level with the assertion that 'I am always infallibly RIGHT, and the other fellow just as invariably WRONG.' It is no more admirable, and no less ridiculous.

With the progressive development of intercommunications, both physical and mental, throughout both hemispheres, the whole world is now a single world-country. There is more actual travelling in foreign countries to-day than there was between our English counties a century ago. The interests of any one country are more dependent upon, and more inextricably intertwined with, any and every foreign country, than were those of any one of our counties with any other county a hundred years ago. In primitive times, Northumberland could get along all right and still know little or nothing concerning Middlesex. To-day England could not exist if she had not immeasurably greater interaction with the lands of every quarter of the globe.

For any man to hold an opinion which binds him to the one country of which he is a native, and permits him to think that his vital interests are not closely bound up in the welfare and success of each and every foreign country, is simply a proof of wilful ignorance. He is truly a greater enemy to himself, and a more dangerous

traitor to his country of which he boasts, than he would have been had he, just previous to the introduction of the locomotive, steamboat and telegraph, adopted the silly policy of 'my COUNTY right or wrong,' or (say) 'Cumberland versus every other county in England'; and including in his political faith the sacred duty of disparaging, defeating the welfare of, stifling the trade of each adjoining county, and being as ignorant in his estimation of the more distant counties of England as he now is of Peru or the Malay Peninsula.

This man can to-day no more damage China or Argentina without injuring his own country and himself, than at the former period he could have laid waste the south of England without feeling some of the consequences in Lancashire.

It is time that men recognised that as citizenship of Wessex is now swallowed up in that of England, so citizenship of England, Scotland or Ireland is now merged in the larger patriotism of the whole world and the human race.

If it is sad to find this false patriotism in any ordinary individual, it is most dangerous in any diplomat.

He builds his entire diplomacy upon ignorance, raises his whole superstructure upon false calculations which defy the true laws of nature, and accomplishes nothing but inevitable ruin and destruction to all upon whose national temple he has been permitted to utilise his energies.

Another false ideal is the prevalent opinion that the vastness of an Empire renders its citizens either any more noble, more prosperous, or happier than they would be if they were inhabitants of a small state.

I would refer readers to that excellent book, *The Great Illusion*, by Mr Norman Angell, for a full and convincing exposition of this fallacy. Very much upon the same lines is the fallacy that the removal of any man of talent or business ability from the country within which he was born is, in any way, a loss. This delusion is one of the mainsprings of the Prussian caste in the demand for their absurd Weltmacht.

Professor Cramb endorses this fallacy, and has crystallised out from the works of these Prussian apostles their gospel according to this delusion. Summarising the question as given by Treitschke, he writes :

'Year by year are we to look on in impotent anger or in apathy whilst the best and most enterprising of our citizens quit the Fatherland, and living under other governments, cease to be Germans, bequeath their worth, that is to say their valour, to those nations who may be ultimately Germany's deadliest enemies ?'[30]

Now the first thing that strikes me about this so-called righteous indignation is that, considering the brand of patriotism which monopolises the individualities of Treitschke & Co., they are doing it a doubtful service by advertising the fact that it is 'the best and most enterprising of our citizens' who 'quit the Fatherland, . . . and cease to be Germans.' This implies a higher compliment to the other countries than it does to their fatherland. It might be a good idea to so improve the fatherland that the counter-attractions of the other countries would cease to lure the 'best and most enterprising of our citizens' abroad. The statement that they are the 'best and most enterprising' citizens who DO emigrate, quite stops any argument that these emigrants do not know what they are about ; and this testimonial also puts out of action any suggestion these 'best,' etc., when they emigrate, are not convinced that their 'best' and their 'enterprise' will find more scope and blossom into a better best and a more enterprising enterprise in the country to which they go, than they consider possible in their fatherland.

It also proves that they find out that this estimation is correct ; because bitter lamentation is made that they stay contentedly in their new countries, where they have ceased to be Germans ; and there is weeping and wailing and the gnashing of teeth because they do not return to the fatherland, bringing their best and enterprise, with all its compound interest added, with them,

[30] *Germany and England*, p. 12.

and craving forgiveness with much sorrow, like so many prodigal sons. No! These men MUST nefariously dwell in the tents of the wicked, and like it, till death do them part, as we are told that they bequeath their valour to these foreign nations, and I scarcely think that Treitschke intends to accuse these men of bequeathing even their valour, without the usual proceeding of dying as a stipulation.

If their valour had been of any brand similar to the only consignment of Prussian valour imported into, and used in any country during the present war, I think that these other nations selected by the emigrants have grave cause for complaint, and advise that a law should be passed prohibiting further importations and renouncing probate of any present threatening bequests.

Fortunately this is not the case, and few countries have not received benefit from those men and women of the German people (as distinguished from the Prussian patriots) who have settled amongst them.

It is a 'false ideal' that genius or talent is a perquisite of any one nation. They are the inheritance of the whole human race.

The only thing which is worth consideration in human history is: What is the level attained by true reason and justice? What is the measure of freedom from injustice and barbarism?

Given that there is a steady progress in freedom and justice, and a progressive shedding of injustices and prejudices, it does not matter a brass farthing to human progress whether this takes place under the national sign of England, France, Germany or Uganda.

It is a childish fallacy which attributes any special quality to any national trade-mark, just as it is an infantile belief which credits parents with unlimited power; as when a child who had been shown an eclipse through smoked glass, exclaimed, as the shadow disappeared: 'Do it again, daddy!' But this primitive fallacy warps the judgment of many adult scientists who claim that any discovery of truth, and advance in invention, is German or English, and thereby

enhanced or depreciated according to each individual's prejudice.

The fact of this fallacious estimation proves that, however admirable the mental development of such men may be, whatever keenness and accuracy their scientific or philosophic faculties may have attained, their faculty of judgment is still sufficiently undeveloped and without sufficient backbone to resist personal bias, and to look clearly at facts through the untinted glasses of human reason, free from fallacious colourings or optical inequalities.

It is a corresponding fallacy to that which has, through secrecy and childish admiration for gorgeous uniforms, His Excellencies, and other Christmas-tree-like trappings, converted diplomacy into a farce, instead of level-headed business.

Here we get the delusion that culture must carry some national trade-mark. It would be as ridiculous to maintain that there is a German truth or an English truth. All developments of science, all inventions, are but extensions of some natural truth. The glory belongs to the individual who makes the discovery. The attempt to stamp it as German or English is as idiotic as the swagger which empty-headed people assume because some distant relation has got his name into the newspapers.

Is any single man or woman, such as Goethe, Shakespeare, Beethoven, Voltaire or Mme Curie, any worse, or any better, because a community who did nothing to assist their genius, and most probably did a great deal to scout it and block it, blatantly exclaims that each word or each note is German, English or Hottentot ?

The insane prejudices which many people mistake for patriotism have run riot during the present war, and we have been subjected to childish and mean outcries that no German music should be performed, or some other equally silly ebullition.

Is a Beethoven Concerto different to-day from what it was previous to August the fourth, 1914 ? Yet men

who ought to know better, and who up to that date would sit enraptured at the divine melodies, make themselves ridiculous by yelping against any repetition of such an artistic treat. This ridiculous pose was resented by the saner people, and strife was avoided by the perpetration of a still more silly regulation, and the fiat went forth: 'No music by any LIVING German composer'! So the noxious germs could not be retrospective if the genius was dead; but they were able to pursue their poisonous activities back through the past years of any genius who still breathed!

It is the old Pharisaical blindness: 'Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?' Why not? It was a legitimate blunder of ancient ignorance; but to-day it is disgraceful evidence of all the blind prejudice without any of the mitigating excuse of ignorance, and it indelibly stamps every person who is swayed by it as not possessing sufficient reason to think honestly, and as devoid of enough justice to entitle him to preside over a court-martial upon a delinquent cat. Carried to its logical conclusion, Germany ought to refuse to use wireless telegraphy, it is Italian; or a steam-engine, it is English; or vaccination, because Jenner lived amongst us; or even to observe the laws of gravity, owing to the fact that Newton belonged to the hated race of the English.

Even when of a nature which many would regard as harmless, false ideals are always a source of danger.

False ideals can only be entertained through false reasoning, and the mental defect which renders false reasoning possible must necessarily falsify true morality, ambition and conduct to conform with the false ideal, otherwise the ideal is at once destroyed. False ideals and warped morality pervade every branch of thought and society.

It was reported in February that the Kaiser had sent the Iron Cross of the First Class to Dr Krupp von Bohlen, with an autograph letter saying that the recipient had earned it by his great patriotic work for the Fatherland.

The great patriotic work consists of the following beneficent activities :—the manufacture of the most devilish machines for wholesale murder ; unblushing bribery, in any part of the world, of any official not proof against diabolical temptation ; the suborning of the Press ; the personal spying activities of Dr Krupp von Bohlen in his tour of the British shipyards and armament factories just before the war ; and criminal business thefts.

To establish the last item, the other charges being already established, I give details which may be new to many readers : An American engineer, Mr Simon Lake of Bridgeport, invented an improved submarine, and submitted the plans to Krupp's, whose directors gave their word of honour to disclose nothing. Eventually they entered into engagements on behalf of the Emperor, whereby the designer was to receive £600,000. As he could get neither his money nor his plans back he expostulated, and was told that the patenting of anything concerning war was illegal in Germany, and that he therefore had no claim.

Mr Lake has since seen several German submarines, and is convinced that they are built from the plans he submitted to Krupp's.

The consideration of the outstanding merits of Dr Krupp von Bohlen, therefore, forces the conviction that upon his true merits he deserves from ten to twenty years of penal servitude, with strict ostracism from any society but that of similar criminals. I fear that the Iron Cross of the First Order will not be considered an equal disgrace, and that the whole moral tone of the Prussian society will have to sink to a level low enough to regard such characteristics as worthy of congratulation.

In concluding this section, I desire earnestly to impress upon every member of the various democracies that there is not a moment to be lost, and that each of us has placed upon him the sacred duty of rescuing national morality and honour from irredeemable damage through the insidious growth of the destroying fungus

of this foul disease which, unless we at once insist upon treatment with the all-powerful disinfectants of open daylight, reason and justice, until even its seeds are utterly destroyed, will penetrate all our life, international, national, social and domestic, and produce the inevitable death of all true honesty, until man shall evolve not higher, into the superman, but sink lower and deeper, into the infra-man.

SECTION V

'TREITSCHKE EXPOUNDED. BERNHARDI EXPLAINED,'* AND BOTH CRITICISED

Reason, Blindness, Intellectual Somnambulism and Inevitable Disaster

I CONSIDER that it is important again to draw attention to the fact that reason is the one and only true guide which will ensure justice in both the national and international relationships between man and man. The highest intellectual attainments, the most eminent scientific genius, single-minded political ambition, sympathetic philanthropy, and, most surprising of all, prolonged study and the learning of professors of history, all, and each, unless dominated by reason, fail to deduce the single—or any truly advantageous—remedy. They must possess the rare faculty of cutting through the universal problem as it is presented by world-manifestations to-day, or elaborated by their own special researches, by means of the only jewel hard enough to penetrate all resistance—namely, the diamond of reason. Many instances will occur to the reader's mind where men, unrivalled in their own science or branch of learning, display a curious susceptibility to error or easy delusion in some other line of thought. This is due to the defect that reason is not the true foundation of all their mental activities.

At present, I am only concerned with what is, regarded from the view of our present subject, the amazing fact that the most learned historians and the most painstaking students of politics will recognise difficulties and diseases in our world relations, yet,

* These four words form the sub-title of Professor Cramb's book.

when they come to offer any solution or remedy, will utterly fail to grasp the one true explanation and cure. They will wander round without the guide of reason, and will offer the most complicated measures, which would only make confusion worse confounded whenever they were not fortunately totally unworkable. I desire to do what I can to demonstrate this curious aspect of the question, in the hope that in so doing I shall be able to provide any reader with the unrecognised clue without which the most learned and abstruse studies only befog; but possessing which, any honest inquirer cannot err.

I have selected for example and analysis the book entitled *Germany and England*, by the late Professor Cramb.

Several reasons have caused me to make this selection. It has been widely read, and will probably exercise considerable influence, which I am convinced will be highly deleterious. It has been recommended to me as an authority, and quoted as such, which proves that the fear expressed in the former sentence is unfortunately true. It is written by a learned professor of history, whose influence has probably moulded the minds of many students. It has a laudatory introductory preface by Professor Bradley, and an introduction by the Hon. J. H. Choate. Therefore, by analysing this book, we recognise the true character of the doctrine endorsed by prominent and influential men, whose recommendation may induce blind acceptance by a dangerously wide circle. We shall find that the essential error which I desire to emphasise is unrecognised by them, and that hopelessly faulty conclusions sound true to their understandings.

The book is described as 'Treitschke Expounded. Bernhardi Explained,' but it would be more correct to say: 'Treitschke Corroborated. Bernhardi Endorsed.'

The unique interest, and an astounding curiosity, in the book is, that after the corroboration and endorsement, Professor Cramb gives an excellent and noble conception of what he states is the British ideal of Empire. Every trait or characteristic which he

mentions is admirable, and stirs the finest sentiments and ambitions. But after painting such a noble picture in the purest colours, what does Professor Cramb pronounce as his judgment, and his hope?

He deliberately orders its utter destruction, and solemnly warns the British nation that the maintenance of these lofty ideals; the obedience to these dictations of justice and freedom; the duty of encouraging and helping the more undeveloped races to partake in your prosperity and advancement as brothers instead of trampling them underfoot to fatten upon their food, or starve them as potential rivals—mean the inevitable death of the British Empire!

Professor Cramb, and necessarily all those who endorse his teaching, demand that we anathematise and annihilate each noble impulse which was portrayed in such enchanting colours; all the freedom, all the justice, all the unselfish help to backward races assisting them to catch up to the more fortunate races in the onward march of humanity, all these are to be ruthlessly shattered. In trumpet tones we are ordered to enlist every ambition, all science and invention and every activity, and devote them with religious fervour to perpetuating and cultivating fratricidal hatreds and wholesale murders on an ever-increasing and more devilishly contrived completeness!

Oh, the pity of it! Oh, the fatuity of human intelligence devoid of the one thing needful—namely, free reason!

How hypnotising such advice from supposed authorities may be is proved by the introduction written by the Hon. J. H. Choate, who—even after reproducing a portion of the noble picture—goes on to say: 'America may well be grateful to Professor Cramb. . . . But if we really wish for peace against all hazards, we must ever strengthen our Navy, and train every youth in the republic. . . .'[1]

Oh, the persistent blindness! Never a suggestion as to any possibility of removing the hazards! Only the

[1] Pp. xvi.-xvii.

non-reasoning and bankrupt expedient feverishly to multiply and intensify all possible hazards, and then spend a miserable and precarious existence in futile and insanely frantic attempts to achieve an impossible condition of stable equilibrium of explosives!

Will man NEVER learn to use his one supreme gift of reason? Will he for EVER be a slave to his cowardice and bury his ONE TALENT?

Let us at any rate have the patience to go through this fair example of Professor Cramb's honest endeavour to state the whole question; and note how at every stage as we progress along the path, the fact that the traveller's eyes have been riveted upon the muddy highway as he laboriously planted his footsteps has rendered him totally blind to, and oblivious of, the finger-posts of reason.

At every turn these mutely appealed to him to turn aside from the pitfalls, and befouling mud, churned by age-long processions of passion-driven feet. Each finger-post implored him to choose for himself and proclaim to all men the joyful tidings of the cleanliness and delightfulness of the paths of reason! In these reason-paths progress is rapid, safe and full of happiness, as men march forward together in the bonds of sympathy and friendship. Up to this day they have been struggling along a treacherous and bloody road, bounded by battle-fields in which most hateful passions riot like carrion over heaps of corpses.

Professor Cramb and every other authority devoid of reason are blind travellers along this road and will not heed the pleading which beseeches them, in the name of humanity, and all that renders home, love and life itself of any value, to leave the present highways of hatred and bloody strife.

It is in the hope of arousing interest by my calling, stimulating thought and dispelling benumbing custom, that I ask the democracies to refuse to follow these hide-bound leaders whose backs still groan under the weight of the loads of irrational hatreds and degrading customs, to which they cling as if their antique rot

rendered them sacred, in blind subjugation to revolting antiquated ideals.

I would entice men's thoughts to the finger-posts of reason, and persuade them to turn their feet along the smooth and clean paths of reason, where the cheek is fanned by the bracing air of freedom, as it blows over fields of cultivated flowers redolent of brotherhood; and grain which banishes poverty and privation; through the plains of peace, ever approaching nearer and nearer to that far-distant—and let us hope never actually attainable—height of happiness and destiny which human nature may be possible of attaining.

I trust that many readers are already acquainted with Professor Cramb's book. I would advise those who are not, to procure a copy,* and read it in the suggested light of reason. I hope that both these new readers, and those who have already read the book, will refer to the book itself as we proceed; so as to save the necessity of making quotations longer than is absolutely necessary here; and also to satisfy themselves that I am doing no injustice to Professor Cramb by my method of selection.

Lecture I. opens with an appeal for Englishmen to study and become familiar with German literature and the elusive atmosphere of the nation. No more sound advice could be given. Prejudice can be founded only upon false premises, or formulated by false judgment. 'To know all, is to forgive all.' It is a pity that Professor Cramb should, at such an early stage, demonstrate the faulty balance of his judgment by giving his first sneer to the 'Radical Member of Parliament'[2] who visits Germany, and returns with partial views. Partiality is not limited to any one political party, and if Professor Cramb was unable to treat his subject with

* Thirteen editions were published since June 1914, and a fourteenth cheaper (1s. net, paper), in January 1915, from which I quote.

[2] P. 7.

a judicial impartiality, his authority is undermined, and his influence over historical students suspected.

In introducing Bernhardi and his publication, *Deutschland und der nächste Kreig*, and, after calling it 'a fair and just book,' he states Bernhardi's thesis in these words: 'What, he asks, is the precise value, the precise significance of that force in its present manifestation—"Germany"? And he has a perfectly definite answer: It is strife; it is war. And the direction of that strife? It is the isolation of Russia by bribes; the destruction of the antagonistic force named France beyond the power of raising her head; and thereafter Germany will be face to face with the day of reckoning with England. "The Hour" to which German officers of a Chauvinist tendency drink, will then have struck.' [3]

Now any teacher who cared anything at all for the true interests of his students, and, through them, of his nation and ultimately of the human race, would have pointed out that this was a blind and debased ambition; an incitement to the mean crime of bribery as the purchase price of treachery; a glorification of violent hooliganism, which Professor Cramb himself would be eager to punish with penal servitude did the aggressor and his victim reside within the same movable frontier. It must culminate in a definite ambition of eventually attaining the eminence of being the one supreme and victorious ruffian. What defect was there in Professor Cramb's mind that caused him virtually to recommend such perverted morality as a credit to Bernhardi, or any other man not a criminal; and as a laudable example to his students?

In describing the rise of Prussia to her dominating position, he says: '. . . Prussia is admirable in her self-restraint. . . . She does not as yet even come forward as Austria's antagonist, despite ultra-Habsburg treachery, ultra-Habsburg insolence.' [4]

Domination by Austria is 'ultra-Habsburg treachery, ultra-Habsburg insolence.' Then why is 'ultra-

[3] Pp. 9-10. [4] P. 19.

treachery and ultra-insolence' of extra power by Prussia a beatitude and benediction to humanity ?

'Prussia strikes when her hour strikes, and in 1740, with the accession of Frederick the Great, that hour does strike; and for the next twenty-three years Prussia appears as the great rebel-State, asserting herself triumphantly, measuring herself in battle after battle against Austria and Austria's allies. All Europe cannot break her spirit or the spirit of her king. It is one of the lofty and exhilarating heroisms of world-history, this conflict of reality against empty formalism. . . .'[5]

To describe the wars by which Prussia simply destroyed a rival for purely selfish aggrandisement as 'one of the lofty and exhilarating heroisms of world-history' is to make a farce of morality, and deny the claims of reason.

Having shown upon what grounds Germany thinks that the British Empire 'is an unreality, her political power is as hollow as her moral virtues; the one an arrogance and pretence, the other hypocrisy,'[6] we get the following:—'Who is to succeed her ? It may not be Germany; some Power it must be. But if Germany WERE to inherit the sceptre which is falling from her nerveless hands . . . ?

'And, having visualised this future, the German imagination, in a tempest of envy or vehement hate, becomes articulate and takes various shapes, resulting in an almost complete arraignment of the British Empire, of the English character, and of all our institutions and all our efforts as an empire-building race.'[7]

What about the 'tempest of envy or vehement hate' ? Is this a glory of the character of the men who are to rule the world ?

Having judged it as 'envy or vehement hate,' he ought to have stamped upon it without mercy, and called upon all self-respecting men of all nations to annihilate it. Had Professor Cramb no sense of humour?

[5] P. 19. [6] P. 22. [7] P. 23.

'. . . The one an arrogance and pretence, the other hypocrisy'! Has there ever been an arrogance as ludicrous as the Prussian military caste? Has the world ever seen a pretence so preposterous as the Prussian claim to kultur? And if British morality is hypocrisy, the English language has not a word adequate to express the degradation of the new dispensation which he here describes as conspiring to supplant it. He endorses Treitschke's idea that our fellow-subjects in India are of this opinion. 'With what feelings must they read the tirades against a nation in arms, the litanies in praise of peace, which argue the slave and the coward at heart.'[8]

This is a disgraceful libel upon the high intelligence of the Indian races. How did Treitschke or Professor Cramb know that these races were infected with the Prussian madness which could conceive of no higher destiny than froth and blood? Professor Cramb goes on to say: 'Now the accuracy or inaccuracy of the various counts in this indictment is irrelevant here.'[9]

This is a silly statement. The whole question is whether they are relevant or insane. When Treitschke or any other man states that our Empire is decayed simply because it has something better to do than prance about the world-stage like a cheap and disgusting buccaneer in a third-rate melodrama, brandishing pistols and swords, and spouting blatant oaths and threats, the statement does not supply one single grain of evidence that Treitschke's idea is not an insane proceeding, no matter how the gallery may applaud.

It is a distressing sight to see a man like Professor Cramb applauding such atrocious drivel. If the British Empire, or any other understudy, should attempt any such performance, it deserves to be thrown violently into a padded room. It certainly does not fill the bill now, and if it ever did so, let us not encourage any other actor to make such a fool of himself in these days. Let us rather express our thankfulness that we ourselves have recovered our sanity.

[8] P. 26. [9] P. 30.

And what is the 'consummation devoutly to be wished'?—'And now, under the Hohenzollern, what is the future? Bernhardi, at least, is explicit: "For us there are two alternatives and no third—world-dominion or ruin, Weltmacht oder Niedergang." It is the interpretation of Treitschke's maxim, "Selbst ist der Mann."'[10]

This makes the issue simple and easy. When any man is such a fool as to swear that he will have the entire loaf, or not even a crumb, he simply prophesies his own starvation. All the rest of us are not such idiots as to be influenced by such foolery.

When any man, whether Bernhardi, Treitschke or Hohenzollern, or any nation, definitely declares world-dominion or ruin, it is equivalent to suicide. Surely the rest of creation have some small claim to be consulted in the matter! It concerns them quite as much as the Weltmacher. Why should all the rest of the equally admirable—regarded from a physical standpoint, and less criminal regarded from any moral standpoint—just lie down meekly and allow any man who thumps his chest and yells: 'Weltmacht oder Niedergang!' to prance over them with his hobnailed boots? Even the Hohenzollern could not expect this in his rational intervals. Would he put up with such a thing himself? If not, what right has he to be so sure that everybody else is a bigger fool than himself?

In Section VI., Professor Cramb becomes pathetic: 'When, turning to England, I consider the apathy or the stolid indifference of the nation—when, for instance, I consider the deliberate and hostile silence or loud calumnies which, for the past seven years, have accompanied Lord Roberts' crusade; and when, over against this apathy, I survey in this month of February, 1913, the energy, the single, devoted purposefulness throbbing everywhere throughout Germany, her forward-ranging effort, her inner life, her army, her fleet, I seem to hear again the thunder of the footsteps of a great host. . . . It is the war-bands of Alaric!'[11]

[10] P. 35. [11] P. 35.

It may be the 'war-bands of Alaric,' but they are a back number in these days. Our sense of morality and ambition has improved since those primitive days, as much as our power for murder and destruction has developed towards the infernal.

To use Alaric's maxims to-day is as incongruous as it would have been for this gentleman to have tried to use our latest 15-inch gun.

Professor Cramb is fond of quoting so-called heroic utterances nearer the Stone Age than the twentieth century; but why is he not consistent enough to insist upon our lighting our fires by rubbing two sticks together?

Shall 'the swords be turned into plough-shares'?

Listen to Professor Cramb: 'The theory of pacificism is a growing force in English thought and English literature, and is, in English politics, apparently becoming a principle of a great and historical party—one of its ideals, at least.'[12]

'In this effusive sentiment for peace, these spasmodic efforts to stop what it names "mad race for armaments," has England, this Power which possesses one-fifth of the globe and an army at least as large as that of Switzerland, forgotten its sense of humour? Do we imagine that the other Powers of the continent see England exactly as England sees itself—England! The successful burglar who, an immense fortune amassed, has retired from business, and having broken every law, human and divine, violated every instinct of honour and fidelity on every sea and on every continent, desires now the protection of the police!'[13]

Of course England does not imagine that the other Powers of the Continent see England exactly as England sees itself. It was one of our own poets who sang:

> 'O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us!'

This shows that the absence of this point of view was a sore point with at least some of us.

[12] P. 43. [13] P. 44.

But Professor Cramb's gospel is: 'If a successful burglar has retired from business, do not, I pray you, be glad with exceeding joy, over one sinner that repenteth, or concerning the world's gain from the abolition of thieving!' No! this is the great chance for that curious 'Der Tag.' The divine call for 'the next gentleman, please,' to prevent morality getting a start, and to deify the ancient and honourable profession of the thief. It is all pitiable nonsense.

I am not quarrelling with their description of Britain's past history as a successful robber, although it is evident, from the passage quoted, that Professor Cramb has adopted the language of bitter jealousy uttered by a burglar who has only rifled a villa, as he watches his rival carry off the silver dishes and spoons from a mansion. But granting the quaint suggestion of righteous indignation on the part of the jealous prospective burglar, why should the long-established firm have such scorn poured upon him for his past methods? Probably he did his best with the methods then available, and it ill becomes a present-day burglar to sneer at those who have brought the traditions of that occupation down to his own day, because he himself has a new patent jemmy, pocket electric lamp, oxygen jet, and a magazine revolver. But for Professor Cramb and other men to join in the sneer against past burglaries, and then pat the modern atrocious brute on the back so violently that all his ironmongery rattles—is nothing less than a prostitution of both morality and reason.

It is no use daubing the word 'Valour' over it. It is only done as a lure to the unwary; just as if the schoolboy hero (for he has his heroes (?) just like Professor Cramb)—namely, the Pirate of the Spanish Main (thick capitals for Pirate and Spanish Main, please)—had christened his shambles of a brig *The Dove*!

Calling it 'Valour' is no more recommendation than any other six letters of the alphabet. Can those who worship 'Der Tag' tell us why this Millennium of the New Morality should have this name, when it is almost violently obvious that 'Die Nacht' was the correct

title? Anyway, 'Der Tag' (or 'Die Nacht'—both in this case, the same) is a patent fraud when dubbed 'Valour.'

Let these men get out a new set of six letters, and I would suggest x's, y's and z's, two of each or varied in number, as we are accustomed to these letters as unknown quantities.

There is one undeniable criticism of Treitschke, Bernhardi, Hohenzollern and their supporters in Germany, and Professor Cramb and every person who agrees with his presentation and policy of the case. It is that they irrevocably cut themselves off from ever being regarded as angels. There is none of the 'joy over one sinner that repenteth' weakness about them. Certainly not! Those of them who reside across the Channel mock the penitent and sing psalms to their own delirium-tremens-like beatitudes, while they sharpen their daggers and pick out their best jemmy and spikiest bludgeon; while those who reside upon our side of the Channel kick the penitent, call him a fool and almost dislocate their own breast-bones with inflation and patriotic thumps while they shout that although in the past we have been a very successful burglar, and broken all laws, human and divine, we were fools ever to give up breaking them as often and as violently as is humanly possible, and that our present observance of laws human and divine provides a spectacle of decay and meanness which nauseates them!

Personally, I think they ought to permit the manifested ideas of the Creator who started the Universe on its ceaseless course up the path of Evolution to be taken into account when deciding what ought to be the ambition and destiny of man.

Evidently, they think otherwise, as they kick the penitent, and point the finger of scorn at him, calling upon him to make his repentance turn a somersault and refuse to worship at the altar of goodwill to man and peace on earth. They bid him grovel before the shrine whose altar is the battle-field, whose candlesticks are 15-inch guns and 6-inch howitzers, whose incense is

the suffocating bomb, and whose sacrifice is the blood and bodies of his fellow-man ! And all that is necessary to render the altar of peace revolting, and the inquisitorial altar of blood entrancing, is for some unreasoning animal who walks upright upon two legs and claims to belong to the genus *homo*, either in print or daubed letters, to plaster this altar of blood with six silly hieroglyphics, thus :

'VALOUR' !

Even had man not got reason, any true sense of humour should have preserved him from such ghastly blundering.

This is not an unfair statement of their position. Of all those prophets who have stumped the country crying (with tears similar to those shed by some inhabitant of the Nile) : 'Perpare ye ! for the day of wrath is at hand !' has any one of them done as much to try and remove evil passions and prevent the revolting murders, as he has to stimulate the repulsing of murders with exceeding murders ?

There may be some 'middle' to this thing, but there can only be two extremes, and these men, no matter what their social positions may be, are at one of them, and it is not the angel end either.

What is the use of Professor Cramb's appeal to the warning given by Demosthenes to Athens, and as a clinching *finale* writing : 'Yet this was her own tragedy. Would England be wiser than Athens ?' [14] Why not ? The question is, would there be any more wisdom, or less insanity, in England of the twentieth century slavishly copying Athens, than there would have been in Athens rigidly adhering to the programme and principles of the Stone Age, and trying to saw their meat with the raw material for the next immortal statue ?

Yet these mock heroics may deceive present-day readers—hence their danger.

In Lecture 2 (26th February 1913), Professor

[14] P. 39.

Cramb tells his students, in regard to his last lecture: 'And the question we had to consider, quite abstractly, was: What, according to the philosophy of history, or even according to the mere processes of common-sense, is likely to result from such a confrontation? Above all, what is likely to result when the first nation, though pursuing colossal organic ideals, yet seems to have become almost weary of the glory of empire, expressing frequently the desire for arbitration, for the limitation of armaments, a "naval holiday," peace at any price; when its war-spirit, its energy, its sense of heroism are apparently diminishing, and the mere craving for life and its comforts seems to be conquering every other passion—as if to this nation the aim of all life were the avoidance of suffering—what, I say, is likely to result, if, confronting this, you have a nation high in its courage, lofty in its ambitions, containing within itself apparently inexhaustible forces, moving on its own path, which in the future may lead it to destinies to which even the imagination of a Treitschke can hardly assign a limit.' [15]

Let us take Professor Cramb at his word, and consider this paragraph 'even according to the mere processes of common-sense,' and analyse the 'expressing frequently the desire for arbitration, for the limitation of armaments, a "naval holiday," peace at any price; when its war-spirit, its energy, its sense of heroism are apparently diminishing, and the mere craving for life and its comforts seems to be conquering every other passion—as if to this nation the aim of all life were the avoidance of suffering.'

Now, common-sense would suggest that—granted that life be given, granted the love and anxiety of parents; granted the installation in the child's mind of some nobility, some ambition, some hope of accomplishing something for the good of others; granted that education had taught this human being the marvellous order of the universe, the reverence of the stupendous system of worlds other than our own, their orderly yet

[15] Pp. 42-43.

marvellous procession leading to the study of their infancy, maturity and decay—all this gorgeousness of the Great, even outshone by the captivating intricacy of the Infinitesimal with its marvels ever increasing from the mass to the molecule, through the atom, to the electron, with the never-finished romance of how the whole powers and forces of the most immense suns are wrapped up in the hereditary vibrations of electrons so minute that the human mind cannot even imagine their dimensions in aggregates of millions ; add to this that each new step in the discovery of their activities gives man ever-extending mastery over the ravages of disease, and renders him master of ever more subtle forces and increasingly efficient machines which perform their intricate manipulations with uncanny skill almost without human supervision, and that man can flash his thoughts across the earth by his latest captive slave, the invisible ether—granting these—I, for one, see nothing deserving the scorn of Professor Cramb, or anybody else, in 'the mere craving for life.' What astounds me is that anybody can be found with recklessness enabling him to scoff at 'life and its comforts.' To mock the 'avoidance of suffering' is to cast ridicule upon the establishment of hospitals, and the whole of the Sciences and Arts of Medicine, Public Health and Sanitation. I cannot follow Professor Cramb there, and do not desire to do so. Surely all these interests, discoveries and blessings for the poor and suffering constitute a more common-sense view of life than the suicidal hobby of looking down the barrel of a gun for just so long as the equally silly fool at the other end of it gives you a chance of doing it !

Professor Cramb says of the Prussians : 'And they exhibit England's overtures to Germany as due to subtlety or cowardice.' [16]

Why not even suspect the existence in the world of improving morality or sanity ?

Again : 'Germany will never sincerely cease arming. If England builds on the dream of Germany

[16] P. 45.

quiescent she is destined to a bloody and terrible awakening.'[17]

This is almost prevarication. He ought to have said: 'Germany will never sincerely cease arming VOLUNTARILY.'

Perhaps so; neither will an old jail-bird cease thieving VOLUNTARILY. But each can be forced to do so. And as national morality insists upon the one, international morality (did it exist) would enforce it upon the other. The present bloody and terrible awakening is not due to any pre-ordained beneficent law of German swagger, but to the fact that England and the other nations were fools not to sink childish jealousies and insist upon this international hooligan becoming respectable, without encouraging him to buy a more deadly revolver and further develop his mania. There was a perfectly easy alternative—namely, combined action, and the forcible removal of his aggressive ironmongery, with reformation of character or reduction of grade into the ranks of the unemployed loafer.

The following ought to surprise law-abiding citizens: 'Bethmann-Hollweg, in 1911, but REPEATS THE TRUTH,* enunciated by Treitschke in 1890, that a nation's armed force is the expression of a nation's will to life, and must advance with that life.'[18]

This is debased morality at any rate. 'Armed force is the expression of a nation's will to power'! Just so, in exactly as noble a way as a highwayman's will to power, and—incidentally—your watch and money. '. . . of a nation's will to life'! Exactly, as an assassin's will to life means murder of his victim'! '. . . and must advance with that life'! But only so long as he is a successful highwayman or assassin. Were international morality not such a farce, the armed force and the advance with that life would either be violently divorced or perish together by the hangman's noose.

Please remember that these sentences quoted from Professor Cramb were not written by him sarcastically,

[17] P. 45. * Capitals mine. [18] Pp. 45-46.

or in caricature. They embody a solemn theory by Treitschke, understood and corroborated by Professor Cramb, and actually taught by him in the hope that they shall mould the future actions and beliefs of Britons as well as Prussians.

These two Professors of History give us as their gospel 'the Science'; the Art has been demonstrated at Liège, Louvain, Senlis, Rheims, and wherever those who have really adopted the theory, with facilities evidently envied by Professor Cramb, have been applying their instruction. My reason impels me to denounce both those who teach such monstrous science and those debauched enough to practise such atrocious art. I do not offer the slightest apology for the strength of my denunciation or the wording of my criticism. Did I attempt to do so, I should insult my reason, besmirch my own self-respect, and be guilty of the treachery of cowardice to my fellow-men.

That his advocacy of the glories of such horrors of international murder and destruction as are now raging in Europe and proving beyond question that man's heritage is far more diabolical than divine, is not merely due to subjection to the glamour of valour, Professor Cramb proves by his sneers at every sentiment or advocacy for peace. He demonstrates that he is prompted by a moral sense of hopeless inversion. This will be recognised from the next few quotations. A man may have a moral blindness which prevents him from seeing the evils in the cause he espouses; but if he also denounces the features of the opposite cause, this proves that he is not blind, but has sight and sees and examines the question. It demonstrates an amazing and lamentable moral squint which distorts his vision, and renders his judgment and advocacy not only false, but also dangerous to a fatal degree.

I shall, therefore, attempt to fit spectacles to correct the squint, so as to render the images presented agreeable with facts, instead of being simply monstrosities.

After casting scorn (which, in my opinion, possesses in this instance the useful characteristics of the boomerang),

upon all 'Peace ideas'[19]; and with misplaced magnanimity remarking: '. . . we are disposed, I say, to be tolerant even to the extravagances of Tolstoi, his appeals to the gospels, for instance, . . .'[20] he emphasises his tolerance by consenting to '. . . listen without smiling when the great Spanish legist Alberdi declares that the soldier is no higher than the executioner, though one would have imagined that the difference between the hangman on the scaffold, pinioning his victim before destroying him, and the warrior on the battle-field, perilling his life, would have been apparent even to a Spanish doctrinaire'[21]!

Professor Cramb might have indulged in his smile, it would have made no difference to the hopelessness of his faulty reasoning.

He has got mixed up, and can only conceive of a soldier on the battle-field and a criminal on the scaffold. He is, therefore, not competent to give any opinion on the matter.

It is essential to start fair, and premise that in both cases the DEATH WAS EQUALLY UNDESERVED.

Granting this, death by hanging is more merciful, in a greater majority of cases, than death after mutilation by shrapnel or bayonet. There is NO TRUE GLORY in suffering mutilation and death from shot or bayonet, and there is NO TRUE DISGRACE in suffering death from hanging. The only disgrace is in the crime which nowadays generally involves the hanging, and even now the disgrace is often more upon those who order or permit it than upon those who suffer it.

When personally undeserved, each death is a crime against humanity itself. Many men and women have died undeserved, and more noble deaths, at the hands of the public executioner, than any soldier who has died because some other man, in a duplicate of his own unreasoning passion and lust for blood 'got his blow in first.' In this case the death cannot be compared, as to nobility, with deaths like those of Bruno and the other victims of man's ignorant devilry.

[19] P. 47 *et seq.* [20] P. 48. [21] P. 48.

Therefore, this sneer of Professor Cramb misses fire.

Later we get: 'Again, there is a whole crowd, to whom I need not refer individually . . . and mere cranks, to whom this phantasm appears the one thing worthy to concern men in any serious manner—all of them having the peculiar characteristic that they approach the plain man, the man in the street, with a slightly truculent air: "Now, why don't you help us to bring about this good of ours?" And there is nothing for the plain man to answer unless this: "The thing you are trying to bring about does not exist—it is simply a nothing . . . this 'universal peace'—what is it?" And then they can only reiterate their belief in the passing away of war, when all our swords shall be turned to reaping-hooks, our barracks into granaries, and, I suppose, all our howitzers into fire-irons.'[22]

I eagerly plead guilty to being one of these 'mere cranks.' And I am as proud of it as I should be ashamed of having written that paragraph. But I insist upon the deletion of the 'slightly truculent' part of the description. Had I enjoyed the acquaintance of the late Professor Cramb, I should have asked him the question he puts into the mouth of the other 'mere crank'; and when he replied that the 'thing does not exist—it is simply a nothing,' I should have replied that the latter phrase was ridiculous nonsense, and that although there is a lamentable amount of truth in the former phrase, this non-existence was the standing disgrace of himself and those who, through deficiency of reason, justice and any sense of true humanity, did their best to make certain that it never should exist if they could prevent it.

That reply might not have been what society is pleased to dub 'polite,' as truth is too strong a scent to please their nostrils. Still all the real sense of the argument would have been on my side. I should also have pointed out to Professor Cramb that it was with pained surprise that I heard him seriously offer, as proof of the futility of efforts for peace, that 'the thing you

[22] Pp. 49-50.

are trying to bring about does not exist,' as this showed a very sloppy process of mental activity. If the thing does exist, we should not be trying to bring it about, but to develop and preserve it. If the thing does not exist, that is a perfect reason for our trying to bring it about. Because a thing does not exist, at any stated moment, there is no reason whatever why it should not exist. In this argument, Professor Cramb has taken up a ridiculous position, but as he involves the 'plain man, the man in the street' in his fallacy, it is necessary to demonstrate the errors to this 'man in the street.'

'. . . the thing . . . does not exist—it is simply a nothing.' There is not the slightest ground to regard this statement as a satisfactory reply to anything whatever. It only demonstrates either ignorance or forgetfulness of the whole processes of evolution and invention. It is no more correct or praiseworthy than had Professor Cramb tried to prevent the sciences of Medicine and Public Health by advising the plain man that the men who were trying to discover some medicine to cure his disease, and of course those who talked nonsense about being able to remove putrefying filth by means of 'new-fangled contraptions called sewers,' were 'mere cranks' cackling about a thing which does not exist—simply a nothing!

Professor Cramb's 'Pacifist cranks' (of whom I am one) regard peace and reason as the best possible remedy for the diseases of war and injustice; and our endeavours are to bring about friendly co-operation between the various democracies, as the best scheme of moral sewage for draining away the hateful passions, armament money lusts, and ignorance, which at present render all international meeting-places pestilential areas.

We are encouraged to do this as at least we remember that unless some thing which does not exist to-day is made to exist to-morrow, the human race is only stagnant. In living processes we know this as 'evolution.' It would have been a silly answer to the slavery abolitionists to remark: 'The thing you are trying to

bring about does not exist—it is simply a nothing. The freedom of man is simply a nothing.' Their answer should have been what ours is to-day: 'All right, if that is so, it is going to be a mighty big something to-morrow—so stand out of my way, or you will get hurt.'

In material things this transition from 'does not exist' to 'exists' is called 'invention.'

It would have discouraged James Watt, as he tried to think out the steam-engine, had Professor Cramb chided him and solemnly warned him that 'the thing you are trying to bring about does not exist—it is simply a nothing,' and gone on to say: 'It is no use trying to utilise the unrecognised force of steam or to harness it and train it for man's benefit. This force does not exist—it is simply a nothing,' and so he might have gone on warning everybody from Watt to Marconi. Fortunately his lugubrious prophecies would not have deterred such men of genius, but they might have caused excessive depression to 'the plain man.' So our present-day 'man in the street' may cheer up, and help to bring into operation to-morrow the 'force of the freedom of man, and peace,' which 'does not exist' to-day. As in other processes of manufacture, we have the handicap that evolution and invention, as they work in the production of blessings for man, turn out also many by-products, some only useless, others highly deleterious. Among the former we may mention the tinsel and frippery which still make our State and judicial functions unrecognisable as important occasions which should occupy our serious thoughts, by addressing their appeal to the eyes only, and stimulating merely the same mental activities as a cheap bazaar or fancy fair. As examples of the really deleterious by-products I would mention 'Weltmacht' and its kultur, guns and other war material, and that section of the Press to which I have already drawn attention in the Section dealing with Diplomatic Methods.

Man's true progress depends upon his clearly recognising the character of these by-products, both useless and deleterious, and ruthlessly throwing them on

the scrap-heap NOW, and so improving his processes of manufacture that in future these waste-products may be eliminated and all power and materials utilised for some useful purpose.

My attention has just been attracted to another, and very important, aspect of this question, by the fact that, as I write, two companies of recruits have passed my window. A fine set of healthy men, marching with precision and freedom of step to the roll of the side-drums as they go to church parade. Of course my reflections upon this incident differ materially from those which would have occurred to Professor Cramb. Still I have an equal right to them, and to their expression.

And they take this form: these are the efficient and voluntary units of the most completely organised, the largest, the most numerously manned, the best equipped and the most costly machine which the British nation has ever seen, or even previously dreamt of. *Cui bono?*

Will any single unit of this machine be one fraction the better for all the energy and every activity consumed in its operation? Here is where many people will think that they see a splendid opening to rush in and triumphantly shout: 'Most certainly they will be better for it all! Have you not yourself just said that they were a "fine set of healthy men"? Why, the training has done them infinite good, and thereby improved the national manhood!' The more who say this the better, as each one proves my argument of sloppy thinking and feeble reason. I grant that the training is excellent for these men. Many of them have never known such health previously. But in order to derive this benefit, it is evident that we ought to alter our present ideas of the methods of life and occupation. Each man would have, nay HAS, received the great benefits QUITE IRRESPECTIVE OF THE FACT THAT HIS NEXT ACTIVITY IS TO BE THE SLAYING OF A FELLOW-MAN. If, instead of proceeding to the battle-field these men employed their new vigour in removing slums, fighting

the atrocious social conditions, training the neglected children, or assisting the downtrodden and unfit, THEY THEMSELVES would receive all the same benefit, with the addition of invaluable mental elevation instead of the approaching mental depression and degradation ; while the world would have gained an irresistible force for good instead of for evil ; a healthy and happy population instead of additional griefs and miseries to the present hopeless sufferings.

Will the products of this present machine supply one single grain of true benefit to any single individual amongst those of us who are not actively employed by it, or to any single surviving unit himself which could not be manufactured with the limited expenditure of energy, time and wealth necessary to talk things over round an office table ? I maintain that every atom of true benefit could be got in this simple manner, and that the whole machine, with its enormous consumption of power and material, is engaged upon no other work than the manufacture of the most deleterious by-product possible for human ignorance and inhuman greed and passion to conceive. Perhaps the sharpest pang of regret is caused by the realisation of the sad fact that not only is the machine employed in producing curses and stumbling-blocks to real progress, but that, were a fraction of the organisation and effort directed to useful work, progress would be marvellously rapid and irresistible.

Is it only a dream of a 'mere crank,' that we may soon see the various States organising such a splendid army of voluntary workers, equipping them with the necessary education and facilities, endowing them with the essential wealth and instruments, and directing their energies as efficiently towards the conquest of poverty, misery and injustice as they now do towards the manufacture of mutual hatreds, murder, destitution, suffering and barbaric despotism ?

All that is necessary is education beyond the sway of animal passions. Let us cure the horrible squint which distorts the vision of all except the 'mere cranks,' who

only share this term with every man who has brought out some new discovery for overcoming diseases, and who was ignorantly anathematised during his lifetime, and subsequently canonised after his death. They ask their fellow-men to experiment with reason-spectacles to correct this almost universal mental squint. They plead for fair treatment and a trial of their honestly considered remedy. Were this adopted and the squint removed, it would be an easy matter to enrol crowds of enthusiastic 'correct perspective' volunteers, who would take pride, and never weary in their efforts as they worked together for the accomplishment of 'the greatest good of the greatest number,' and the ennoblement of man. The two companies of recruits whom I have just watched as they passed my window, could alone, under the higher education and the new dispensation, in a few months transform this city until men would acclaim that man had 'inherited a new heaven and a new earth.'

I shall still cling to my vision, and rejoice that I am a quite incurable 'mere crank.'

As such, I fail to see any sense in Professor Cramb's sneer about 'all our swords shall be turned to reaping-hooks, our barracks to granaries, and, I suppose, all our howitzers into fire-irons.'

With which of these does he quarrel? Let us pin him down to his argument. . . . A 'granary' is of more use than a 'barrack' to the nine-tenths of our nation who at present have anxiously to calculate how many halfpennies they can invest with the baker, and then whether the purchased product is honestly sufficient to give the children even a dog's chance of that physical and mental development which is the birthright of every human life brought into this world. And his scorn of the rearrangement of our ironmongery is also misplaced. Either the reaping-hook or the saucepan have done more good for humanity than the sword or the howitzer.

Of course vested interests will also decry the sending back to the furnace of swords and howitzers so that they

can be recast into some useful shape. Fire-irons are not as 'classy' as guns, neither will men pay scare prices for them; but their universal utility renders any objection based upon manufacturers' profits not only selfish but actually criminal.

Anyway, any martial ironmongery, mostly as antique curiosities, which I may possess, is only waiting for the new dispensation to be transformed into saucepans or fire-irons.

Notwithstanding Professor Cramb's scorn about 'Pacificists who throw wide the field hospitals and exhibit doctors and dressers at work on the wounded, . . .,' etc., etc.,[23] I would strongly recommend this course of study to every rational human being. Any man who shouts for war, without full knowledge of its horrible details, is less intellectual than the stork with his head buried in the sand to keep away the lion. And any man who knows the true details and yet shouts for war possesses a callousness which even the lower animals would repudiate had they the same knowledge.

The next page gives us more scorn upon attempts to secure peace by mutual international consent: 'The peace of the world must be secured, indeed; but it is to be secured not by religion but by a GREAT CONSPIRACY,* or co-operation, if you like—of all the forces of industry throughout Europe.'[24] Well, I DO like. If a 'conspiracy' takes place between everybody, it is fair to call it 'co-operation,' and I think that the honest artisan who tries to 'conspire in co-operation' so that all may 'conspire' to save life instead of murdering it, wears a nobler garland of honour than the most exalted or widely read personage who goes through the hypocritical performance of making lame attempts with his left hand to succour the suffering, while with his right hand he mows down regiments of his equally deserving fellow-men with a machine-gun.

It is interesting to notice the curious tone of the following paragraph:—'Yet despite this hubbub of talk down all the centuries war has continued—absolutely

[23] P. 50. * Capitals mine. [24] P. 51.

as if not a word had been said either on one side or the other. Man's dreadful toll in blood has not yet all been paid. The human race bears still this burden. Declaimed against in the name of religion, in the name of humanity, in the name of profit-and-loss, war still goes on, and to this day it is there—there in the Balkans, raging at this hour!'[25]

Surely this is another inconsistency. The tone is characteristic of lamentations, while, if 'valour' is born only of war; if 'the mere craving for life' is so reprehensible, surely Professor Cramb ought to have incorporated his thoughts in a psalm of thanksgiving. 'Man's dreadful toll in blood has not yet all been paid. The human race bears still this burden.' Whatever is the matter? Professor Cramb has just anathematised peace, and pronounced his choicest benediction upon war. Yet here he declaims that his blessed panacea is 'a dreadful toll in blood,' and a burden upon the human race! Will he never be satisfied? He cannot possibly have it every way. Which voice shall we obey?

It is at least discouraging to find that just as soon as we have worked ourselves up, and knocked our reason down, so as to be eager to give back bray for bray to the Prussian who greets us across the narrow sea, this contradictory, and scarcely complimentary, testimonial to war comes along and takes all the starch out of us.

I think we should be perfectly justified in taking an interval in our military antics, and calling the score evens between the 'valour' and the 'toll in blood' (I think we could afford to give the 'burden' a miss-in-baulk), while we consider whether a blessing which is also a curse is really worth all the upsetting passion and waste of wealth necessary for its recommended intensive cultivation; or whether, while this mental cat is making up its mind which way to jump, it would not be really wise policy to give a short experimental trial to the

[25] P. 52.

opposition remedy of peace, although its testimonials are provided by 'mere cranks.'

Professor Cramb quotes Frederick the Great, and Bismarck, etc., as authorities whose recommendation of war simply finishes the argument. Again he is mistaken. These men may be interesting studies in psychological pathology, but we go elsewhere for our ideals or our morality.

After mentioning 'motives and ideals, which defy the analysis of reason—mysterious and dark forces,'[26] we are told : 'It is easy, for example, to demonstrate that the glory of battle is an illusion ; but by the same argument you can demonstrate that ALL glory and life itself is an illusion and a mockery. Nevertheless men still live and go on pursuing that illusion and that mockery.'[27]

Firstly, if anything defies my reason, I am not so silly as to 'put all my eggs in one basket,' and then blindly entrust that basket to that one ununderstandable speculation. THAT is the advantage of utilising 'even the mere processes of common-sense,' it saves you from foolishness in more ways than talking politics.

It is a pity that Professor Cramb did not give us the benefit of his easy demonstration that 'ALL glory and life itself is an illusion and a mockey.' He might have found it easy, but it would have been mere child's play to show the ridiculousness of his contentions, and to get him all tangled up in strings of 'valour' and 'dreadful tolls in blood,' so that he would find that other things than war can 'become a burden.'

It is a rather unique and curious doctrine, that 'life itself is an illusion and a mockery.' I should like to have watched Professor Cramb tackling some healthy athlete, and endeavouring to detain him from joining in some contest because 'ALL glory and life itself is an illusion and a mockery'! The Professor would probably have received the concluding argument which the aggressive temperance advocate was fortunate enough to escape as he heeded the preliminary warning

[26] P. 57. [27] P. 57.

given by his victim under the following circumstances. Going up to a man who bore distinct evidences of not being a 'blue-ribbonite,' he addressed him: 'Eh, my friend, it makes my heart bleed to see you in this condition!' Whereupon he received the reply: 'Well, you mark my words. It'll make yer nose bleed too, if yer don't mind yer own business!'

Still, Professor Cramb's curious statement is interesting.

I regret that it is impossible to do full justice to Professor Cramb's book without lengthening out this review beyond moderation.

There are many 'gems,' but not 'of purest ray serene,' which must be left in the deep, unfathomed caves, for want of quotation. But I strongly recommend readers to fish them up for themselves. They will repay the trouble by their novelty, which reminds me of Mark Twain's Map of Paris, which 'put the situation in an entirely new light.'

I must ask pardon for pointing out one or two more, as, in regard to the violent overthrow of the British Empire, we are informed that: 'And what are the feelings towards England which this great historian and orator expresses? He incessantly points his nation onwards to the war with England, to the destruction of England's supremacy at sea as the means by which Germany is to burst into that path of glory and of world-dominion towards which, through all the centuries of her history, she has deliberately moved. The Ottonides in the tenth century sketched the plan; it has been reserved for the Hohenzollern in the twentieth to fill in the details.' [28]

Josh Billings was wise enough to advise: 'Never prophesy unless you KNOW.' There seems a hitch somewhere in the Hohenzollern programme. That just shows the danger of following agenda or sketches made by Ottonides in the tenth century. You ought not to expect all the artists to remain the same all that time, and the Hohenzollern probably now wishes that his

[28] P. 71.

reserved seat had not been booked. The whole performance has a distinct resemblance to the unfortunate position of the man whom the Americans describe, in their picturesque slang, as 'having bitten off more than he can chew.'

I would suggest that this quoted paragraph should be re-edited in any subsequent edition. This could easily be done by putting a full stop (.) after the word 'burst,' and deleting the remainder.

'Upon a young and virile nation, a rising military State, daily growing in power, Pacificism can never exert much influence for evil; there is no possibility of such a nation being seriously turned from heroism.'[29]

It is a real pleasure to be able to agree with Professor Cramb most heartily; 'Pacificism can never exert much influence for evil': nor any at all on any State, whether it is young and virile, or old and feeble, and it can do nothing but extreme good to any 'military State,' whether it is unfortunately 'rising' or deservedly being taught a violent lesson in honesty and justice, which are for it—as yet—undiscovered territories.

Evidently Professor Cramb's heart is wrung with sympathy for poor Treitschke, as he narrates that 'Britain's world-predominance outrages him as a man almost as much as it outrages him as a German. It outrages him as a man because of its immorality, its arrogance and its pretentious security. It outrages him as a German because he attributes England's success in the war for the world to Germany's preoccupation with higher and more spiritual ends.'[30]

There! 'If ye have tears, prepare to shed them now!' What a pathetic sight! These twin brothers in adversity suffering because of Britain's immorality, when there is an endless supply of the 'home-made article which defies' (thank goodness) 'imitation,' and 'as purveyed direct from the Prussian manufactory to the inhabitants of Louvain, Senlis, Rheims, and every place where our branches are established'! 'Our Arrogance — "Zabern Brand" — Trade-mark

[29] Pp. 63-64. [30] P. 92.

"Potsdam," and consumed (by force) by all the German people—cannot be beaten.' I trust that this testimonial will have to be amended, in its last claim at any rate.

'Pretentious security' reminds me of the late Sir W. S. Gilbert's panegyric on his *Prince Agib*, where he tells us that:

> 'His gentle spirit rolls, in the melody of souls.—
> Which is pretty—but I don't know what it means!'

'Pretentious security' is decidedly 'pretty,' but has it any meaning at all? 'It outrages him as a German because he attributes England's success in the war for the world to Germany's preoccupation with HIGHER and more spiritual ends'! I think that instead of Professor Cramb being torn with grief at poor Treitschke's regrets, all the rest of us ought to sympathise with the relatives of both of them.

Germany has been absorbed in HIGHER ends, and yet this is a fact which these two men regret as a fatal error, and heartily wish that they had been WISE enough to be lamentably foolish, and NOBLE enough to scorn higher and more spiritual ends, and seek only the regretted opportunities for acting the thief and the cut-throat! Again, Professor Cramb treats a remark made by Bismarck as conclusive: '"France," said Bismarck in September 1870, "must be paralysed; for she will never forgive us our victories."'[31]

Not only is this no authority, but it is nonsense. It is well to point out to 'the plain man' that a silly statement is none the less silly because it was made by a great man. If Bismarck thought that it was possible to paralyse forty million people of any nation, he did not know what he was talking about. Fortunately we have his own record and tearful recantation when, within five years of the date of the above utterance, and his diabolical attempts to paralyse, he mourned that France has recovered from the war far more successfully than had Germany, and the business would have

[31] P. 92.

to be done all over again. Many people are now talking similar rubbish about capturing German trade. They seem to think that international commerce is exactly the same as their infant game of 'shop' across a box in their nursery, where they had the monopoly of buttons and cherry-stones and subtly annexed all their younger companions' paper money.

A little serious study would show them that while it is quite possible to start the manufacture in this country of those commodities previously obtained from Germany, each successful enterprise means that Germany will have to start the manufacture, at home, of those goods which she previously bought from England. If we do not take these imports from Germany, we only lose those exports to Germany which we used to send in exchange. When things have settled down again we shall recognise the further fallacy that for us to continue the manufacture in England of any special article which can be produced cheaper or better in Germany, would be an excellent example of the curious wisdom demonstrated in 'cutting one's nose, to spite one's face.'

I must allude to a statement where Professor Cramb describes a lecture by Treitschke. 'But before all and above all that audience came together to hear the story of the manner in which God or the world-spirit, through shifting and devious paths, had led Germany and the Germans to their present exalted station under Prussia and the Hohenzollern, those great princes who in German worth and German uprightness—Aufrichtigkeit—are unexampled in the dynasties of Europe or of the world.' [32] Phew!

All that is necessary is to present to-day's photograph of the Hohenzollern, those 'great princes who in German worth and German uprightness—Aufrichtigkeit—are unexampled in the dynasties of Europe or the world.' It is worth printing that over again, as a statement like that wants reading more than once. The first time, you think that something has gone wrong

[32] P. 89.

with your eyes, or that you have got the book upside down. However, we now know that both Treitschke and Professor Cramb really meant it.

It would be correct here to remark: 'Nuff said'; but I want to record my protest against this portrait being foisted off upon the German (*i.e.* extra-Prussian) nation. It is a gross libel upon their perspective and colouring.

The Germans themselves are searching round for a more descriptive word than 'Aufrichtigkeit.'

On 15th August 1914, *The Times* published a copy of a manifesto of the German Humanitarian League, in which the Kaiser was described as: 'the uncurbed tyrant, surrounded by parasites, now directing the most desperate, devilish, and selfish campaign ever waged against humanity'; and as 'the despot whose insatiable egotism is drenching Europe with the blood of its workers and wage-earners.'

Most people will agree that the more recent co-operative portrait is more natural—almost a speaking likeness, compared with the former one painted by the two historical partners.

Anyway this manifesto established the fact that the present voting upon the resolution 'that "Hohenzollern" and "Aufrichtigkeit" be regarded as synonymous terms,' is not 'carried unanimously,' or even '*nem. con.*'

'Aufrichtigkeit' may be what has been described as a 'portmanteau-word,' and really contains a long list of complimentary features; but I think the German nation will require a 'Saratoga-trunk word' adequately to express what they now desire to say about the Hohenzollern.

Professor Cramb rightly derides the sentiment expressed in a quoted verse of 'Rule Britannia.' Such inanities occur in all countries, and had Professor Cramb still lived, he would have found this verse, and the more depressing ones in our National Anthem, had been eclipsed in Germany by their 'Hymn of Hate' and their 'God punish England.'

This latter prayer is only the German prose version of our :

> 'O Lord our God, arise,
> Scatter his enemies
> And make them fall !
> Confound their politics ;
> Frustrate their knavish tricks ;
> On Thee our hopes we fix :
> God save us all.'

This species of blasphemy is not confined to one side of the Channel. I have been told that my criticism of England was severe ; but I stand about midway between the 'My country right or wrong' irresponsibles and Professor Cramb, who focuses his criticism in the phrase :

'"Old England," old, indeed, and corrupt, rotten through and through.' [33]

Perhaps this partly explains his glorification of German valour. He may have regarded Prussia as a Sanitary Inspector who could disinfect England. His error here is that the proposed disinfectant has a more revolting smell and is far more poisonous than the corruption to which he desires its application.

The study of Professor Cramb's book, *England and Germany*, is perhaps most interesting from the point of view of the necessary study of Professor Cramb's psychology, as autobiographically recorded.

There has not been such an interesting and startling study of dual psychology since the clever description of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde. So far, we have been concerned only with the Mr Hyde personality, but in Professor Cramb there is also a noble Dr Jekyll.

I desire to be absolutely just, and while giving my honest—ifsevere—criticisms of the Mr Hyde personality. I shall pay my respects to the Dr Jekyll manifestation.

Professor Cramb gives what I call a noble statement of what Empire ought to be. I should like to think that this panegyric were deserved in every detail. Were I convinced of this, I should be more proud than I am of my citizenship.

[33] P. 94.

In my desire to do Professor Cramb full justice. I shall quote his remarks in as full a manner as I think will entitle me to the merit of having given all the material evidence I can produce in favour of the one whom I have arraigned before the public tribunal of readers.

'In the same manner, if I were asked how one could describe in a sentence the general aim of British Imperialism during the last two centuries and a half, I should answer in the spirit of Dionysius: To give all men within its bounds an English mind; to give all who come within its sway the power to look at the things of man's life, at the past, at the future, from the standpoint of an Englishman; to diffuse within its bounds that high tolerance in religion which has marked this empire from its foundation; that reverence yet boldness before the mysteriousness of life and death characteristic of our great poets and our great thinkers; that love of free institutions, that pursuit of an ever-higher justice and a larger freedom which, rightly or wrongly, we associate with the temper and character of our race wherever it is dominant and secure.

'That is the conception of Empire and of England which persists through the changing fortunes of parties and the rise and fall of Cabinets. It outlives the generations. Like an immortal energy it links age to age. This undying spirit is the true England, the true Britain, for which men strive and suffer in every zone and in every era, which silently controls their actions and shapes their character like an inward fate—"England."'[34]

'To give all men within its bounds an English mind—that has been the purpose of our empire in the past. He who speaks of England's greatness speaks of this. Her renown, her glory, it is this, undying, imperishable, in the strictest sense of that word. For if, in some cataclysm of Nature, these islands and all that they embrace were overwhelmed and sunk in sea-oblivion, if to-morrow's sun rose upon an Englandless

[34] Pp. 125-126.

world, still this spirit and this purpose in other lands would fare on untouched amid the wreck.

'To the German accusation cited in the opening lecture that in India England has made no new experiment in religion, it can be answered that more than any other conqueror of India she has permitted the genius of its race to continue its own developments, that religious propagandism has never formed part of her political creed. She has even, at stated intervals, checked the inopportune or intemperate zeal of missionaries of her own race. And how is it thinkable that an English Shah Jehan should ever arise to imperil by bigotry the continuance of the British Raj ? At moments, indeed, this empire seems to resemble a vast temple, with the vaulted skies for its dome and the viewless bounds of this planet for its walls. And within that temple what prayers arise, in every accent, and what sound of hymns to every god that. down the long centuries, the human imagination has created or adored !

'To give all men an English mind—that ideal has been our guiding star through all the phases of our empire.

> '" . . . Se tu segui tua stelle
> Non puoi failire a glorioso porto."

'And, until now, Dante's noble verse has been most strangely, most greatly realised by the English. Who shall affirm how long that ideal shall yet govern England's actions ? '[35]

I should be as proud, had I written those paragraphs, as I should be ashamed of any claim to authorship of the rest of the book.

They show a dignity and a conception of right which deserve the adjective 'noble' which I have applied to them.

How was it possible for any one man to write these paragraphs, and also to write the quotation given from only thirty-one pages earlier—*i.e.* '"Old England," old, indeed, and corrupt, rotten through and through' ?

[35] Pp. 127-128.

Please reread these two noble statements, and compare them carefully with quotation number 13, part of which I shall repeat, to emphasise the amazing contrast:

'. . . England! the successful burglar who, an immense fortune amassed, has retired from business, and having broken every law, human and divine, violated every instinct of honour and fidelity on every sea and on every continent, desires now the protection of the police!'

The only merciful, and the only possible, judgment is, that here we have a rare instance of dual psychology.

Would that the Dr Jekyll psychology alone had existed!

What might not our nation, and through us the world at large, have gained from such principles disseminated with such talent, and driven by the energy which pervaded his work.

Universal politics would have owed a debt of gratitude to Professor Cramb had he fructified the minds of the pupils who came to learn from him with such seed, instead of searing their political consciences with the pernicious stuff given in this book as constituting his series of lectures.

But alas! The malevolent Mr Hyde psychology almost entirely dominated the duality.

I am amazed that any man who could formulate such an ideal could by any possibility cast it aside as rubbish, and espouse and idealise its antithesis!

It is as great a mystery, and an equally lamentable calamity, as if some man who could see such beauties in a glorious landscape, where man, beast and Nature rejoiced in happiness and mutual friendship in the sunlight of a beautiful English summer day could paint a picture the genius of which made all beholders envious of the people and their ecstasies; and then, in the midst of our rejoicing, we saw this man, with all his artistic talent, all his word-painting, turn voluntarily from the scene, with curses upon such happiness falling from his lips, and bitter warnings that all such happiness was

simply a nothing, commanding all men to abjure all that had made this happiness, and to follow him into a noisome cavern, there to spend the rest of their existence, devoid of sunlight, in perpetual darkness, amid gloom which permitted no outlook, thoughts which stifled hope, and only the companionship of toads, snakes and other reptiles!

Yet this is exactly what Professor Cramb does! The beneficent interregnum of Dr Jekyll is cynically and mercilessly cut short by the resumed domination of the Machiavellian Mr Hyde.

Only four pages later we experience a stunning blow as we read the following:—'In a treaty with an enemy that treaty is binding only so long as you make your enemy see gleam behind the parchment the point of a sword; and the verdict of history upon alliances is unmistakable and explicit. Whatever principle may govern individual friendships, alliances between nations and States are governed by self-interest only; they are valid only so long as mutual fears or mutual desires persist in equal force. For the friendship of nations is an empty name; peace is at best a truce on the battlefield of Time; the old myth or the old history of the struggle for existence is behind us, but the struggle for power—who is to assign bounds to its empire, or invent an instrument for measuring its intensity?'[36]

And this book concludes with the following paragraph:—

'And if the dire event of a war with Germany—if it is a dire event—should ever occur, there shall be seen upon this earth of ours a conflict which, beyond all others, will recall that description of the great Greek wars:

> '"Heroes in battle with heroes,
> And above them the wrathful gods."

And one can imagine the ancient, mighty deity of all the Teutonic kindred, throned above the clouds, looking serenely down upon that conflict, upon his favourite

[36] Pp. 132-133.

children, the English and the Germans, locked in a death-struggle, smiling upon the heroism of that struggle, the heroism of the children of Odin the War-god!'[37]

Apart from the pathos of it, that paragraph is as near to the Prussian lunacy of claiming unique intimacy and community of interests with the deity as anybody outside their own imbecile circle has ever written.

Oh, the tragedy of it! It is pitiable that such a noble soliloquy should be ruined by subsequent irrational raving.

It is as if the orator had aroused our enthusiasm and inspired our ambitions for victory over disease and misery, and then dashed us into the depths of despair by pointing out that one cholera germ existed in a state of activity upon our neighbour's premises, and UPON THIS GROUND ALONE, commanded us to throw all our medical and sanitary sciences to the dogs, and return to primitive conditions, cultivate these deadly germs in our own homes, and exchange health and cleanliness for disease and corruption.

Still, I remember the Dr Jekyll interval, and this moulds my personal feelings more to sorrow than anger.

But this does not in the slightest degree alter my estimate of the awful danger which the dissemination of the Mr Hyde ethics may cause, and the perhaps irreparable damage already done by the fourteen editions of this book.

Although I have dealt thus fully with this book by Professor Cramb, I consider that I ought to refer shortly to one or two of the other apologists for war. It is a curious and inexplicable fact that when attacking any line of argument some position may be assaulted and successfully captured, the defender acknowledging that it was untenable, yet he will retire into an exactly similar refuge, built upon the same faulty ground, the very act of removing from one block-house to another, on the same line of defence, blinding him to the fact

[37] Pp. 136-137.

that he has only reoccupied the recently demolished indefensible position.

It is well, therefore, to demonstrate that in storming and destroying the Treitschke-Bernhardi-Cramb line of opposition, we have really also got behind and rendered of no value every individual position upon the same level, whether such individual defender was soldier, admiral, historian, politician, essayist or poet.

Mr Norman Angell, in a recent work,* gives a valuable selection of such outposts and their defenders, all trying to hold the same strategic line of argument.

I shall only give a few lines from some of the quotations given by Mr Angell in his chapter dealing with 'Prussianism in our Midst.' My purpose is not to 'steal his thunder' (as I strongly recommend everybody to read this valuable book); I only desire to demonstrate that when the same fallacy is advanced by many men, the destruction of any one defending position admits us behind every other defender upon the same strategic line, whether he be foreign or native, professional or lay, learned or unlearned.

'Thus, Lord Roberts earnestly warns his fellow-countrymen "not to be led away by those who say that the end of this great struggle is to be the end of war, and that it is bound to lead to a great reduction of armaments; nor should we pay any attention to the foolish prattle of those who talk of this war as the doom of conscription."

'In March, 1911, when every pulpit and every newspaper, under the influence of President Taft's message, promised us within a brief period universal peace and disarmament, the German Chancellor, Herr Bethmann-Hollweg, had the courage and common sense to stand apart; and, speaking for his Emperor and his nation, to lay down as a maxim that, at the present stage of the world's history, the armed forces of any nation or empire must have a distinct relation to the material resources of that nation or empire. This position seems to me as statesmanlike as it is unanswerable;

* *Prussianism and its Destruction.*

but in applying the principle to our own country, I should be inclined to modify it by saying that the armed forces of any nation or empire ought to represent, not only its material resources, but the spirit which animates that nation or empire—in a word, that its armed forces should be the measure of the nation's devotion to whatever ends it pursues.' *

Admiral Mahan states: '. . . Such predominance forces a nation to seek markets, and where possible, to control them to its own advantage by preponderant force, the ultimate expression of which is possession. . . . From this flow two results: the attempt to possess, and the organisation of force by which to maintain possession already achieved. . . .''

'The existence of might is no mere casual attribute, but the indication of qualities which should, as they assuredly will, make their way to the front and to the top in the relations of States.'

Ruskin wrote: 'All the pure and noble arts of peace are founded on war. . . . There is no great art possible to a nation but that which is based on battle. . . . All great nations learned their truth of word and strength of thought in war; they were nourished in war and wasted by peace; taught by war and deceived by peace; trained by war and betrayed by peace.'

In an article in *The Nineteenth Century*, entitled 'God's Test by War,' written by Mr Wyatt, we find: 'The truth is that armaments are the reflection of the national soul. . . . Therefore, if in the gigantic process of international competition England fall before Germany—which fate may God avert—then that fall will follow from no other destiny than the destiny interwoven with the universal law which in this article I have attempted to set forth—the law that the higher morality tends to produce the greater military strength. . . .'

'The discovery that Christianity is incompatible with the military spirit is made only among decaying peoples. While a nation is still vigorous, while its population is expanding, while the blood in its veins

* For full quotations, see *op. cit.*, pp. 80-100.

is strong, then on this head no scruples are felt. . . . What is manifest now is that the Anglo-Saxon world, with all its appurtenant Provinces and States, is in the most direct danger of overthrow, final and complete, and of the noble qualities upon which all military virtue is built. Throughout that world, in churches and in chapels, on the platform, as in the pulpit, in the Press, and on the stage, which is our chief temple now, the voice of every God-fearing man should be raised, through the spoken or through the written word, to kindle anew the spark that is dying, to preach the necessity of self-sacrifice for the country's cause, and to revive that dying military spirit which God gave to our race that it might accomplish His will upon earth.'

Personally, I think that the best criticism on Mr Wyatt is '!', followed by the remark that in future we must never interfere with fights between tigers or hyenas, whether in the Zoo or native freedom, as these combats to the death may be the spark kindled anew and just as certainly ordained as similar exhibitions by the higher animal—man.

Lord Grey says: '. . . But it is essential that each claimant for the first place should put forward his whole energy to prove his right. This is the moral justification for international strife and for war, and a great change must come over the world and over men's minds before there can be any question of everlasting peace, or the settlement of international difference by arbitration.'

I hope that Lord Grey is strenuously helping the rest of us to hurry up that great change, and is not restricting his efforts only to the 'international strife and war' end of the business.

Professor Spencer Wilkinson writes: 'The Great Alternative is such a chance given to England—a choice between the first place among the nations of the world and the last; between the leadership of the human race and the loss of Empire and of all but the shadow of independence. The idea set forth in this book is that England has the choice between these two

extremes, with no middle course open to her.' Sounds quite like 'Weltmacht oder Niedergang'!

Colonel Maude advances: 'War is the divinely appointed means by which the environment may be readjusted until ethically "fittest" and "best" become synonymous.'

We evidently had no need to translate Treitschke or Bernhardi.

Major Stewart Murray, speaking of the seizure of the Dutch fleet in 1807, says: 'Nothing has ever been done by any other nation more utterly in defiance of the conventionalities of so-called international law. We considered it advisable and necessary and expedient, and we had the power to do it; therefore we did it. . . . For people in this country to talk of the sanctity of international law is nothing but hypocrisy or ignorance.'

Of course, therefore, Major Stewart Murray is working might and main so that in future we should have the right to call upon others to obey international law, without it being 'hypocrisy or ignorance.'

Dr Miller Maguire produces a special brand of 'tidings of comfort and joy,' thus: 'The proper strategy consists in the first place in inflicting as terrible blows as possible upon the enemy's army, and then in causing the inhabitants so much suffering that they must long for peace and force their Government to demand it. The people must be left with nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war. It will require the daily and hourly exertions of those who have been burnt out to procure a scanty subsistence to sustain life.'

Dr Miller Maguire is not a fit person to be allowed to work in an abattoir.

No amount of authorities can make wrong into right. Remember that man is an animal and is still evolving into a supra-animal. It would be no argument if the majority of men counselled wrong; it would not transfer it into right any more than if they had not spoken. Right has always, throughout history, been maintained firstly either by a single individual, or by a few. Those men who quote Christianity and its

supposed blessing of war, but prove the infantile condition of their own reason. They seek to prove that the bestial atrocities of war, and the lying of diplomacy are right, because they are according to almost universally held ideas, and of such ancient establishment; and inversely that the few who proclaim a higher morality and destiny are wrong, being merely dreamers and illusionists. But to prove this proposition they have the amazing inconsistency to appeal to a religion whose founder formed a minority of one, and whose ideas were scouted and reviled with a bitterness and ignorance as great as their own to-day against the newer extension of this doctrine of 'Peace on earth and good-will to man'!

The number of authorities quoted, or their eminence as men, matters nothing. Mutilation and murder are just the same whether you call them assassination, martyrdom, war, valour or military glory. There is the same infliction of suffering, where there should be happiness; the same transformation of years of love, service and hope of his family, the possibilities of genius or work for the human race—into nothing but a corpse, which must be buried or burnt for the protection of the living. Of course it is more or less easy to shift the labels upon any reality, but that is only foolishness and does not affect the reality. Any man may tack any one of the above labels on to the slaying of another, still the crime remains the same. If the entire human race agreed to call the day the night, and the night the day, it would do nothing more than make it doubtful whether those of us outside asylums ought not to change places with those at present within them. It would not make the human eye blind to the vibrations we now call light, nor would it force the retina to respond to the absence of those vibrations. It would be as ridiculous as trying to alter the breed and character of your dog, by changing his name from Tiny to Lion.

Neither a manifesto from the twelve apostles, an encyclical from the Pope, a combined edict from all existing crowned heads, nor a unanimous vote of

Parliament would, in the least degree, lighten the guilt of a wrong or raise it into a right. A lie is as big a lie if uttered by a saint as by a sinner.

The moral blame increases in proportion to the opportunities for knowing the higher morality available to the utterer of the lie, or the perpetrator of the wrong.

In upholding war because it has always existed, and sneering at universal peace because it has never existed, these men should leave religion alone, as by their appeal they imply that the founder of their religion, which was at that time what they would now scout as 'some new-fangled morality,' was wrong; and the men to whom he appealed should have frustrated his efforts and silenced his tongue by the simple process of producing quotations from living, or dead, so-called authorities, singing the praises of the then-existing abuses which he had denounced; maintaining that because injustices and abuses had persisted in past times, and persisted at that day, they must continue to exist for ever, and it was really ridiculous of him to deny that they formed the essential attributes of human nature. They should have substituted some other word in place of our discussion upon war; and told this teacher of a new morality that his ten commandments were silly as '. . . was only human nature'; that 'man had always done . . . and would always do it'; that this very action he denounced was 'the only thing which kept the valour of the race alive, and that without it any nation simply decayed.' In fact they might have offered every argument at present advanced for war, in defence of each and every abuse denounced by the founder of their religion. Yet those men who did attempt to defeat the founder of the religion to which these men appeal, and which they profess for themselves, were dominated by excusable ignorance, while present-day apologists for war are merely slaves to a false ideal which must be eradicated.

It is no use their dressing up their passion, lust of power and financial cupidity in their cloak of ignorance and the mask of their darkened reason, and then

singing psalms to it as a deity under the name of war. Every man with more light of reason sees clearly through the disguise, and refuses to worship the horrible skeleton under their betinselled robe, and the grinning skull behind their mask.

The essential trouble is the persistence of the slavery to old traditions, centuries after the progress of thought has annihilated every conception upon which they were founded.

Man's knowledge has grown, his interests have extended from his hearth, beyond his country and his nation, until he depends upon the whole world for both his material necessities and his artistic satisfactions. Yet while his mind now grasps the larger possibilities of commerce, he has stunted his reason and his higher nature, so that he still attempts to cramp his sentiments, his affections and his sense of justice within the old narrow circles which bounded his knowledge also in the Middle Ages.

The natural consequence is that two such unequal forces cannot pull in unison, and while his sympathies can follow his activities as far as his own national boundaries, they are too feeble to accompany them farther, and, his reason being thus powerless to guide him, suspicions, hatreds and passions, unmodified by any sympathy, uncontrolled by any reason, run riot over all the newer territory of his activities. This fatal error is the result of our absolutely false conception of what ought to form what we know as education.

Education ought, as its highest essential, to be directed firstly towards the improvement and development of character; and only as character is developed ought knowledge to be cultivated.

The present idea of education is to cram the latest and widest knowledge into the same cramped character which was able to digest the limited easily digested interests of former centuries. We are 'pouring new wine into old bottles'; and they burst.

We are cramming world-wide relationships into

characters bound by sympathies and reason which will not stretch beyond our own national capacities; with the result that all the knowledge beyond the true character-capacity is uncontrolled, slops over, and accumulates into masses of unclean and dangerous debris.

It is this fundamental error which permits men, otherwise learned, to advance the arguments of national prosperity being co-equal with national brute force. Within their own countries they sympathise with commercial prosperity, and even the keenest business man does not now dream of rendering his own firm predominant by slaying the proprietors and staffs of rival establishments. Yet when this same man looks across a frontier his sympathies, reason and justice have run out, and are bankrupt. Only his passions remain; and we find him raving at an exactly similar contrast with a successful trader across this imaginary and adjustable line; calling out for the aid of national 'armies, navies, and international murder:' to destroy those identical business capabilities so desirable in himself, and so commendable in his fellow-countrymen.

Were his knowledge less, and he were denied the knowledge of the details of foreign trade, as were his forefathers, there would not be the same danger of international jealousies, greed and hatred. His knowledge would have been reduced to the measure of his character. But as our present methods of education have supplied him with forced feeding of knowledge without any regard to the capabilities of his character digestion, a form of mental indigestion has become chronic. The advantage of such mental digestion is that if it is wisely developed, *pari passu*, with the quality and quantity of the knowledge food presented for consumption, there is no limit to the healthy absorption, and the character may grow in healthy vigour, extending its power until it may wander at will through all the fields of knowledge, gathering its fruits, and consuming them to its fullest satisfaction, with the assurance that its digestion is so healthy and vigorous that nothing but

extraneous poison, malignantly administered and accepted by the individual through carelessness or recklessness, is potent to upset its healthy character and produce symptoms of bilious jealousy, or painful disturbances.

Most solemnly do I warn my fellow-men against any dealings whatever with the delusion and the degraded morality of the teaching we have been considering. I have done what I can to antidote the poison, and to restore true health to the educative movement in the democracy.

Reason and justice are alone the true guides. Without the never-ceasing co-operation of these two guides, even religion itself is powerless. What we know as religion has certainly failed in the past to make any attempt to ennoble the race. Its present position is aptly given in a miniature which, I believe, appeared in *Punch*. It was recorded that a little girl startled her mother with a fervent ejaculation: 'Oh, mother! I DO wish I was an angel now!' And in answer to her mother's anxious inquiry for her reason, she replied: 'Cause then I should be able to drop bombs on the Germans!' I do not quote this as a joke, but as food for serious thought.

Nothing but conscientious battling, despite derision and social ostracism, to educate public opinion and to persuade men to THINK for themselves, and to REASON for the sake of others, can stem the undermining of the rock by the waves of false ideals, false ambitions, greed of power and traitorous betrayal for gold, now grouped under the label, 'patriotism,' which lash against the only true rock foundation for the temple of man.

Let us quell the waves with the oil of reason, so that mankind may resolutely reject this new and degrading 'sermon of unrightcousness,' and that man's higher nature may reject it as completely as during nearly two thousand years his lower nature has violated the Sermon on the Mount.

Let us work for the time when this higher nature shall adopt, and act upon the morals of the neglected

Sermon on the Mount, as thoroughly as up to now man's lower nature has carried out the inverted morality of this baser appeal to his passions.

The teachings of the perverted morality and ethics which constitute this policy of valour; this amazingly irrational appeal to decide how the human race may achieve its highest destiny; this fatuous proposal that true advancement and progress can be aided by—instead of drowned in—bloodshed, has been formulated and approved, and is now being preached throughout all nations, as if it were a modern Sermon on the Mount.

Mr Norman Angell quotes a passage from a recent work, *The Anglo-German Problem*, by the Belgian author, Dr Sarolea, in which occur the following sentences:—'After all, German statesmen are only applying the political lessons which England has taught them, which Mr Rudyard Kipling has sung, and Mr Chamberlain has proclaimed in speeches innumerable. . . . It is only, therefore, in so far as both nations will move away from the old political philosophy that an understanding between Germany and England will become possible. . . . It is the ideas and the ideals that must be fundamentally changed: "Instauratio facienda ab imis fundamentis." And those ideals once changed, all motives for a war between England and Germany would vanish as by magic. But alas! ideas and ideals do not change by magic or prestige—they can only change by the slow operation of intellectual conversion. Arguments alone can do it.'

Those of us who are gaining ostracism by actively opposing this low morality are not doing it for personal gain.

Nothing would be easier than to stump the country, appealing to the passions of the upper classes, and betraying the masses of the people by cunningly playing upon the ignorance and undeveloped mental powers which are no true disgrace to them, as they never had a chance of dispelling the ignorance by adequate education and the hopeful stimulus of instilled ambition. The passions of the educated are a deep disgrace to

them personally, but the stunted development of the democracy is the disgrace of the whole nation, which varies its apportionment of blame in proportion as its origin is either thoughtlessness or meditated class prejudice.

Were it not for true self-respect, it would be easy by blatant appeals to these passions and ignorance, while still sheltering under the disguise of that dangerous unknown quantity called patriotism, by speech, prose or jingle, to ensure an enthusiastic popularity in this generation, which I trust will be execrated as traitorism by succeeding generations.

But some of us prefer ostracism by the present passionate and ignorant, in order that we may be assured that as mankind progresses this verdict will proportionately be revised, and misunderstanding being removed, our motives will obtain that appreciation and recognition which we trust will be valued by our descendants, though denied to ourselves.

It is so easy—and so unprincipled—to entice men down the alluring slope of passion and destruction; but so difficult and unpopular to try and get a few steps in advance, and plead with them to follow to the higher level. Herein lies the appalling danger of the new crusade. Still, with firm resolve, let us press forward, recognising that the greatest glory truly belongs to the man who held aloft this banner of justice and reason, unsullied; ever above the warring throng and, calling upon his brothers to follow, cheering them through apparently hopeless struggles, encouraging them when the curses of passion and hate assailed them, and finally leading them—perhaps battered and weary, but triumphant—out of the slough of despond and degradation, to the heights from which they may clearly see the promised land, where the memories of toil, the sounds of passion shall fade into a setting from which the jewel of his future hope shall glitter in the sunshine of human happiness. Then he shall march forward in the pride of his victory, thankful that through much danger he has preserved his honour untarnished, his banner

unsullied; rejoicing in the new harmony which rings through his soul, echoing the words of our poet:

> 'That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
> May bear the gree, and a' that.
> For a' that, and a' that,
> It's coming yet, for a' that,
> That man to man, the warld o'er
> Shall brothers be for a' that.'

SECTION VI

THE EVANGELIST EXPLAINS THAT HIS GOSPEL WAS MERELY A DREAM-PICTURE, AND HIS PROPHECIES INTENDED AS LAMENTATIONS

Bernhardi Redivivus

SINCE writing my criticism of Professor Cramb's book, *Germany and England*, General Friedrich von Bernhardi has, with the especial permission of the Kaiser, published a protest against what he designates as a false estimate of his work, *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg*. This protest has been republished in Britain under the title of *The New Bernhardi*. It consists of a collection of six articles, the first four being reprinted from *The New York American*, while the remaining two are from *The Times*.

I have an ingrained hatred of customs and proverbs, as I believe that their only function is to evade thought and discussion and to attempt to maintain both thought and conduct within the ancient boundaries which existed when these customs and proverbs first crystallised out into current mental coin. But if anything would convince me of the unimpaired veracity of any one proverb, Bernhardi's *apologia* would do so as regards that French token: *Qui s'excuse s'accuse.*

I consider that it would be wise for me to add a supplementary section and shortly to criticise Bernhardi's latest publication, so as to demonstrate that the position I have already taken up in regard to his teaching has not been weakened in any single detail, and that readers may not be inclined to deduct any discount whatever from the evidence already given, because they understand that the accused has made another statement subsequent to the trial.

It would have been a real pleasure to me to go through *The New Bernhardi* in even as full a manner as I have

done with Professor Cramb's book, although, fearing the reader's weariness, I then often regretfully passed by many delightful objects of interesting study.

I must, however, impose upon myself a self-denying ordinance, and merely shortly mention a few gems, and catalogue a few more, hoping that the reader will follow the indications given, refer to the publication itself and to the quotations I have already given and which I can here only indicate by their individual reference number in Section V.

It is a curious sample, and the keynote of Bernhardi's explanation, that in repudiating Professor Cramb he should say: 'Professor Cramb's book bears on its cover the legend, "Bernhardi Answered"!'[1] As I stated previously, Professor Cramb's book is marked: 'Treitschke Expounded. Bernhardi Explained.' I have also stated that Professor Cramb's book might have been advertised as: 'Treitschke Corroborated. Bernhardi Endorsed.' It is a misrepresentation of Professor Cramb to alter the word 'Explained' into 'Answered.'

My criticism of Professor Cramb was directed to proving that he had explained, and manifestly adopted Bernhardi's teaching; and I hoped that my criticism would merit the title of an answer to Bernhardi, *via* Cramb.

Bernhardi expresses consternation as Professor Cramb's book may be more dangerous because 'the book even bears the stamp of a certain internal conviction'![2] It certainly does that. But so it ought, and so does his own book, *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg*. Would Bernhardi be pleased to be told that his *magnum opus* bore no trace of a certain internal conviction? If so, why did he write it? Although 'charity covers a multitude of sins,' it would split the cloak of charity right across to attempt to stretch it sufficiently to include *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg* as either a subtle satire or as a work of humour.

[1] B, p. 39. To save repetition, I shall use the letter A to indicate *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg*; and B, for *The New Bernhardi*.

[2] B, p. 38.

Bernhardi indignantly denies that Prussia * has ever entertained the policy so clearly demonstrated by himself as 'Weltmacht oder Niedergang.' He waxes wroth over the insinuation that the national education has been prostituted so as to impregnate the whole national mind with the seeds of such a monstrous offspring.

'In a similar manner does Professor Cramb treat German literature in general, in so far as it is known to him—and to all appearance that is not far. . . . Nothing could be further from the truth. . . . Almost never is the work of the German scientists or historians knowingly allowed to take on political colour.' [3]

Yet he has formerly maintained: 'The scheme for universal peace is similar. . . . The agitation for peace introduces a new element of weakness, discussion, and indecision, into the divisions of our national and party life. . . . Its apparent humanitarian idealism constitutes its danger. . . . Every means must therefore be employed to expose these visionary schemes. They must be publicly denounced as what they really are—as an unhealthy and feeble Utopia, or a cloak for political machinations. Our people must learn to see that THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE NEVER CAN OR MAY BE THE GOAL OF A POLICY.† . . . The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessing of war, as an indispensable and stimulating law of development, must be repeatedly emphasised. The apostles of the peace idea must be confronted with Goethe's manly words:

> '"Dreams of a peaceful day?
> Let him dream who may!
> 'War' is our rallying cry,
> Onward to victory!" [4]

As I consider this point as the crux of the whole trouble, I shall accept Bernhardi's recent challenge, and try to prove that the excellent fountains of knowledge in Germany have been maliciously poisoned by insidious

* I repeat that I use the word 'Prussia' so as to exonerate the German people from blame except in so far as they have submitted to the Prussian buccaneering morality.

[3] B, p. 42. † Capitals Bernhardi's. [4] A, p. 37.

contamination with Prussian mad delusions and perverted morality. If I succeed, I shall establish two conclusions. Firstly, that this recent denial by Bernhardi is only a further excursion of the Prussian disregard for all morality, human or divine; and, secondly, that simple justice demands that the German people themselves should be judged rather by those characteristics and industry which have given them such eminence in science and invention, art and literature.

While the whole nation must suffer retribution for the military despotism with all its horrors, we should mete this out to the German peoples more in sorrow than in anger, while from the Prussian hierarchy we should exact the uttermost farthing not only for their diabolical atrocities to all civilisation, but also for their debauchery of their own fellow-nationalities.

It is impossible to imagine a deeper blackguardism than that which would criminally poison the infant mind, abort every idea of rectitude, blast every nobility with inculcated hatred, transmute ambition into an obsession for world-wide murder and devastation, and replace the golden rule by a mania for the slavish subjection and cupidious exploitation of all other nations.

Yet this is the actual performance of Prussianism.

How has Bernhardi the brazen effrontery to deny it after writing thus:

'It is quite refreshing to read in the new regulations for middle schools of February 10, 1910, that by religious instruction the "moral and religious tendencies of the child" should be awakened and strengthened, and that the teaching of history should aim at exciting an "intelligent appreciation of the greatness of the fatherland."'[5] 'One thing appeals to the heart of boys, and another to the heart of girls; and although I consider it important that patriotic feelings should be inculcated among girls, since as mothers they will transmit them to the family, still the girls must be influenced in a different way from the boys.'[6]

[5] A, p. 250. [6] A, p. 252.

'Our national school of to-day needs, then, searching and thorough reform if it is to be a preparatory school, not only for military education, but for life generally.' [7]

'Finally, the Realien, especially the history of our own country, should claim more attention, and patriotic feelings should be encouraged in every way.' [8]

'A compulsory continuation school is therefore an absolute necessity of the age. It is also urgently required from the military standpoint. Such a school, to be fruitful in results, must endeavour, not only to prevent the scholar from forgetting what he once learnt, and to qualify him for a special branch of work, but, above all, to develop his patriotism and sense of citizenship.' [9]

'. . . that the mind, which thinks only of itself, perishes in feeble susceptibility, but that true moral worth grows up only in the love of the fatherland and for the State, which is a haven of every faith, and a home of justice and honourable freedom of purpose. Only if national education works in this sense will it train up men to fill our armies who have been adequately prepared for the school of arms, and bring with them the true soldierly spirit from which great deeds spring.' [10]

'I have examined these conditions closely because I attach great importance to the national school and the continuation school as a means to the military education of our people. I am convinced that only the army of a warlike and patriotic people can achieve anything really great. I understand, of course, that the school alone, however high its efficiency, could not develop that spirit in our people which we, in view of our great task in the future, must try to awaken by every means if we wish to accomplish something great. The direct influence of school ends when the young generation begins life, and its effect must at first make itself felt very gradually. Later generations will reap the fruit of its sowing. Its efficiency must be aided by other influences which will not only touch the young men now living, but persist throughout their lives. Now,

[7] A, p. 252.
[8] A, p. 252.
[9] A, p. 253.
[10] A, pp. 253-254.

there are two means available which can work upon public opinion and on the spiritual and moral education of the nation; one is the Press, the other is the policy of action. If the Government wishes to win a proper influence over the people, not in order to secure a narrow-spirited support of its monetary policy, but to further its great political, social, and moral duties, it must control a strong and national Press, through which it must present its views and aims vigorously and openly. The Government will never be able to count upon a well-armed and self-sacrificing people in the hour of danger or necessity, if it calmly looks on while the warlike spirit is being systematically undermined by the Press and a feeble peace policy preached, still less if it allows its own organs to join in with the same note, and continually to emphasise the maintenance of peace as the object of all policy. It must rather do everything to foster a military spirit, and to make the nation comprehend the duties and aims of an imperial policy.

'It must continually point to the significance and the necessity of war as an indispensable agent in policy and civilisation, together with the duty of self-sacrifice and devotion to State and country.' [11]

'I regard it, therefore, as one of the most important duties of a Government like ours to use the Press freely and wisely for the enlightenment of the people. I do not mean that a few large political journals should, in the interests of the moment, be well supplied with news, but that the views of the Government should find comprehensive expression in the local Press.' [12]

'More important, perhaps, than teaching and enlightening by the Press is the propaganda of action. Nothing controls the spirit of the multitude so effectively as energetic, deliberate, and successful action conceived in a broad-minded statesmanlike sense. Such education by a powerful policy is an absolute necessity for the German people.' [13]

'The soul of our nation is not reflected in that part

[11] A, pp. 254-255. [12] A, p. 256. [13] A, p. 256.

of the Press with its continual dwelling on the necessity of upholding peace, and its denunciation of any bold and comprehensive political measure as a policy of recklessness.

'On the contrary, an intense longing for a foremost place among the Powers and for manly action fills our nation. Every vigorous utterance, every bold political step of the Government, finds in the soul of the people a deeply felt echo, and loosens the bonds which fetter all their forces. In a great part of the national Press this feeling has again and again found noble expression.'[14]

'We Germans have a far greater and more urgent duty towards civilisation to perform than the Great Asiatic Power. We, like the Japanese, can only fulfil it by the sword.

'Shall we, then, decline to adopt a bold and active policy, the most effective means with which we prepare our people for its military duty? Such a counsel is only for those who lack all feeling for the strength and honour of the German people.'[15]

Dr Emil Reich states that: 'This Greater Germany, or the expansion of the German race' (as if such a thing existed—as if the Germans had not the blood of all the nations in them) 'has become a dogma with the Germans. Even in their school books it is publicly taught. See the following from the manual of Herr Daniel, professor of Geography at the Royal College at Halle:—

'"France was primarily a small kingdom born of the dismemberment of Charlemagne's empire and bounded by the Rhone and the Saone rivers, and has only expanded at the expense of Germany; during the Middle Ages Lyons and Marseilles were German towns."'[16]

Again: 'It is especially religious societies that distinguish themselves by their zeal. The Odin Verein of Munich, the Gustav-Adolf Verein have especially devoted themselves to the evangelisation of Austria; the arrest of one of their missionaries, pastor Everling,

[14] A, p. 257. [15] A, p. 258.
[16] *Germany's Swelled Head*, p. 42.

caused some sensation at the time. The Evangelical League has conducted with great ardour the "Los von Rom" ("Away from Rome!") campaign, for which in 1903 it had already disbursed 400,000 marks. All seem to fulfil a sacred function, the exaltation of the national name and greatness. "The King at the head of Prussia, Prussia at the head of Germany, Germany at the head of the world."' [17]

Such evidence lends probability to the assertion that in the Kaiser's secret speech he said: '. . . to accomplish all this and still more, we simply have to invade England.

'You do not look at all surprised, gentlemen, and I see from the joy on your faces that my words have found an echo in your hearts. At last this idea, which is so popular with the greater part of my people, and to the propaganda of which I am so much indebted to the untiring efforts of my professors, teachers, and other loyal patriots, is to become a fact—a fact certainly not anticipated by the English panic-mongers when first creating the scare of a German invasion. Our plans have been most carefully laid and prepared by our General Staff.' [18]

But there is also irrefutable evidence of this sinister education of the German nation. In the Secret Army Memorandum published in Berlin, 19th March 1913, we find: 'Public opinion is being prepared for a new increase in the active army, which would ensure Germany an honourable peace and the possibility of properly ensuring her influence in the affairs of the world. The new army law and the supplementary law which should follow will enable her almost completely to attain this end.

'Neither ridiculous shriekings for revenge by French, chauvinists, nor the Englishmen's gnashing of teeth, nor the wild gestures of the Slavs, will turn us from our aim of protecting and extending Deutschtum' (German influence) 'all the world over.' [19]

[17] *Germany's Swelled Head*, p. 49.
[18] *German Spies in England* (Le Queux), p. 42.
[19] F. 2. Enclosure I.

'Our new army law is only an extension of the military education of the German nation. Our ancestors of 1813 made greater sacrifices. It is our sacred duty to sharpen the sword that has been put into our hands and to hold it ready for defence as well as for offence. WE MUST ALLOW THE IDEA TO SINK INTO THE MINDS OF OUR PEOPLE THAT OUR ARMAMENTS ARE AN ANSWER TO THE ARMAMENTS AND POLICY OF THE FRENCH. We must accustom them to think that an offensive war on our part is a necessity, in order to combat the provocations of our adversaries. We must act with prudence so as not to arouse suspicion, and to avoid the crisis which might injure our economic existence.' [20]

I claim that the above evidence, although curtailed by the limits of space, fully establishes the fact that the entire German nation has been aborted by the poisonous morality which has been the inevitable result of Prussian domination. Also that this abortion has been carried out by secret and stealthy seduction, as demonstrated in the constant appeals for criminal suggestion and passionate temptations.

Indeed, Bernhardi himself claims the same conclusion. 'From the discussions in the previous chapter it directly follows that the political conduct of the State, while affecting the mental attitude of the people, exercises an indirect but indispensable influence on the preparation for war, and is to some degree a preparation for war itself.' [21]

Only in so far as the welding of heterogenous fragments into one co-operative whole has there been any merit in the Prussian work for the German Empire. The fatal mistake has been that this physically dominant race has been able to extend its autocracy over both the mental and the moral spheres of the combined nationalities: although it is intellectually hopelessly incompetent, and morally inherently incapable in these lines of development.

[20] F. 2. Enclosure II. See reference 26, Section II.
[21] A, p. 260.

The natural result is the lamentable spectacle of an intellectual race infected by inflated madness, and a moral people debauched by immoral intoxication.

Regarded in this light, we can recognise the explanation—if not the excuse—for the present failure of civilisation.

The Prussian system of education is to be judged by its results. What they deem kultur is demonstrated in the demoniacal violences of Louvain, Senlis, etc.; the murder, deliberately and in cold blood, of a thousand civilians on the *Lusitania*; men and women civilians who have never lifted a finger in this war—and, foulest of all—children whose heritage should have been the glorious task and ambition of erecting a true civilisation worthy of humanity upon the ruins and ashes of that apostate civilisation now writhing in the awful agonies of maniacal suicide; science transmuted by this kultur into the devilish ingenuity of poisonous asphyxiating gases and incendiary bullets.

Their belauded valour has eliminated that word from the vocabulary of every other nation by portraying it as the name of drunken atrocities, blackguardly outrage and the accomplishment of unimagined exaggerations of every bestial passion.

It is well here honestly to recognise the fact that war itself is an atrocity. It would still be a disgrace to humanity and a reversal to the brutal animal passions even in the impossible event that it was waged only between selected men, capable of ordinary gentlemanly conduct and wearing kid gloves. But even this would still be impossible for a nation of truly moral individuals, as the mere fact of war is positive proof of the triumph of ancient animal lusts over human attributes. It is, therefore, as imbecile to expect this saturnalia of passions without a considerable proportion of atrocities and outrages as it would be to expect a fighting pack of wolves to sit down and discuss the ethics of their quarrel.

The crowning devilry of the Prussian system is that its cunning scheme of planting the germ of the mania in the virgin soil of infants, and the forced cultivation of

its noxious growth throughout childhood, youth and adult life, has naturally produced such a perverted national mental condition that fiendish ingenuity and malignant industry have produced a harvest of fruits embodying hitherto unimagined vileness and cruelties.

So much for Bernhardi's claim that Prussian influence has only been beneficent.

In order to demonstrate that Bernhardi 'B' is not successful in persuading the democracies that Bernhardi's 'A' was a dove of peace, and that what appeared to us all as aggressive militarism was in reality the 'cooing love song,' I must shortly indicate one or two of his explanations which do not fit in with the facts.

Before doing so, I should like to mention a delightful dig which Bernhardi administers to Professor Cramb.

Professor Cramb asked melodramatically: 'Do we imagine that the other Powers of the Continent see England exactly as England sees itself?' [22]

I was forced to admit, reluctantly, that I associated myself with the poet's lament that this was scarcely probable. I regret that I cannot give the presentment which Professor Cramb's eloquent portrayal of England shows in the Bernhardi Prussian mirrors,[23] but every reader should examine this word-picture.

I stated previously that I feared that Professor Cramb had painted in too much of a blue colour. Bernhardi has retorted with a portrait executed in too violent and bilious a yellow; and I can only hope that the true result is really a quite respectable neutral green, compounded of the two blended together.

I have always thought that a great deal of the social and international friction arises from the lamentably uncultivated intellectual development, which is so feeble that it allows people's judgment to pronounce every goose in their own family or nation to be a swan, and every goose in any other family or nation to be only a scarecrow. I therefore clearly recognise that Professor Cramb's portrait of England is really a swan picture, but there are many evidences that Bernhardi's portrait of England is just as much a scarecrow picture.

[22] See reference 13, Section V. [23] B, pp. 52-59.

I will only mention one false perspective as a sample of Bernhardi's wrong drawing. He states that 'the Colonies might consult their own interests, should England have her hands tied by a great war. It is not unlikely that revolutions might break out in India and Egypt. . . .'[24]

It is quite true that the Colonies have 'consulted their own interests,' but in a manner which must have astonished Bernhardi as much as it disappointed him.

In order that he may not still be buoyed up with false hopes, I trust that Bernhardi has seen the announcement: '. . . but what of India? The answer is best given perhaps in the fact that India is now being emptied of many of her troops, and that nevertheless Mr Tilak, the most able and inveterate of all the Indian agitators against British rule, who had only just been released from six years' imprisonment for preaching sedition, is calling upon his countrymen to support the Government. "They must sink all differences," he said, "since the presence of their rulers was desirable, even from the point of view of self-interest."'[25]

Bernhardi now maintains that Prussian militarism is really a philanthropic movement, and he gives an interesting piece of evidence. 'In 1870 it defended itself against France's attempted violations, and in the struggle attained its freedom and its imperial unity on French soil.'[26]

This is one of Bernhardi's statements, Class 'B.' I prefer to believe the real prisoner's statement, cynically published by Bismarck, in which he claims to have personally caused this war by his self-initiation into the class of common forgers.[27]

But in view of Bernhardi's new address to the jury of public opinion, I claim the right to produce another extract from the original confessions of the forger Bismarck. After describing the dejection of his two

[24] A, p. 148.

[25] Reuter telegram from Poona, quoted in *The Round Table*, 14th Sept.

[26] B, p. 62.

[27] See reference 1, Section IV.

guests and accessories before, and after, the act, he narrates the joyous exhilaration produced by the sympathetic crime: 'They had suddenly recovered their pleasure in eating and drinking, and spoke in a more cheerful vein. Roon said: 'Our God of old lives still and will not let us perish in disgrace." Moltke so far relinquished his passive equanimity that, glancing up joyously towards the ceiling and abandoning his usual punctiliousness of speech, he smote his hand upon his breast and said: "If I may but live to lead our armies in such a war, then the devil may come directly afterwards and fetch away my old carcass."' [28]

So this recent claim of Bernhardi's, and his mock heroics about forged valour, etc., may be dismissed. For myself, the consideration of this autobiographical sketch by Bismarck makes me wonder whatever place these three men occupied in the economy of nature. They most certainly did not leave a balance of good to their account when audited by Moltke's friend; as no matter how highly the political or military activities of the three of them may be estimated by political students, the damage to the race which they engineered in this war and its sequences is proportionately so immense that it makes the total good look like a postage-stamp on a ten-acre field. And no men who are so absolutely devoid of any sense of humour as these three buffoons described in this extract could have got any real happiness out of life; the pleasure in eating and drinking after the digestive tonic of the forgery would not count as a tie to life which would outweigh a frayed collar.

Bernhardi must also suffer the abiding agony of natural inability for humour, or he could not solemnly put forward some of his statements, like the following, in which he complains about Professor Cramb's suggestion that Prussian militarists considered: 'Is it possible to find any moral justification for a war upon England? This is supposed to be the problem the answer to which forms the innermost purpose of my book.

'This, however, is a direct and an absolute misrepre-

[28] *Reflections and Reminiscences*, vol. ii., p. 100.

sentation. The putting of such a question, even to my own imagination, was altogether impossible, for the reason that I took the standpoint that Germany would not and should not attack England, but, on the other hand, that England would attack us.' [29]

Yet Professor Cramb, like everybody else, could be excused for gathering such an idea from Bernhardi's own statements: 'In this position of affairs it would be more than ever foolish to count on any change in English policy. Even English attempts at a *rapprochement* must not blind us as to the real situation. We may at most use them to delay the necessary and inevitable war until we may fairly imagine we have some prospect of success.

'If the Imperial Government was of the opinion that it was necessary in the present circumstances to avoid war, still the situation in the world generally shows there can only be a short respite before we once more face the question whether we will draw the sword for our position in the world or renounce such position once and for all. We must not in any case wait until our opponents have completed their arming and decide that the hour of attack has come.' [30]

But the measure of Bernhardi's reliability can be gauged from another instance also. Call to your recollection the Secret Army Order: 'Berlin, March 19, 1913,' which contains: '. . . But in the next European war it will also be necessary that the small States should be forced to follow us or be subdued. In certain conditions their armies and their fortified places can be rapidly conquered or neutralised; this would probably be the case with Belgium and Holland. . . . If, on the contrary, their defensive organisation was established against us, thus giving definite advantages to our adversary in the west, we could in no circumstances offer Belgium a guarantee for the security of her neutrality.' [31]

Now Bernhardi must suffer from total necrosis of the funny bone, as well as complete anæsthesia of the cheek, when he can publish, in his last production, the

[29] B, 40. [30] A, p. 287. [31] F. 2. Enclosure II.

following :—'My book, therefore, felt no need of finding a moral justification for this war, though it did not fail to inquire how England would ever be able to justify its attack upon us. (It is an attack for which we gave not the slightest just cause ; the violation of Belgium's neutrality, employed by England as the pretext for the waging of the war planned long ago, was not committed first by us ; France, England and Belgium themselves had violated this neutrality before ever a German soldier put his foot on Belgian soil.)' [32]

It seems rather a pity that *The New Bernhardi* was written before the recent Prussian exhibitions of international letter-writing and infra-rational secret plotting and traitorism, as Bernhardi would almost certainly have added to the list of extra-Prussian pioneers in fracturing the neutrality of Belgium, the names of the United States of America, Rumania, Chili and the South Sea Islands.

Finally, one instance of quaint goose-swan judgment. Bernhardi declares that Prussianism has been actuated only by Sunday-school-book motives ! He states that it feels only a deep 'desire for religious freedom.' He continues : 'There is indeed penetrating the best souls of our nation a deep impulse. It is not, however, one which finds its expression either in Napoleonism or in the ideas of Nietzsche, but in a truly religious field ; in the striving of the individual for spiritual freedom. Thls striving finds its inspiration in Christian morals from which the husks of bygone times have been stripped, and in an enlightened patriotism, a determined resolution to secure for the German nation position alongside of the other great cultured nations which corresponds to its spiritual importance. Neither a new world religion nor a new world dominion is sought in Germany.' [33]

I can at last agree with Bernhardi and take my oath that the Prussian 'striving finds its inspiration in Christian morals from which the husks of bygone time have been stripped. . . .' But why did they throw away every atom of grain along with the husks ?

[32] B, p. 40. [33] B, pp. 50-51.

The entertaining process performed by the gentle Prussian winnower can be studied in Bernhardi 'A.' I will only show the result of one single whack of the flail, and the reader must guess whether it is not really the husks which are retained after the Prussian has annihilated all the grain. '"Love God above all things, and thy neighbour as thyself." This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties.'[34]

Where is Bernhardi's sense of humour? Why cannot he see that because he, or anybody else, likes to dub his own particular weakness with the *alias* of 'duty,' this childish proceeding does not necessitate that any rule or law with which it clashes may be disregarded, 'since its application to . . . would lead to a conflict of duties'!

Such an idea is as ridiculous as if a bungling workman, who had botched a job, upon applying his result to the standard gauge and, of course, finding it hopelessly out of truth, should take the easy but imbecile course of throwing away the gauge, because it did not agree with his own one particular production.

It would be just as easy to persuade oneself that stealing, equally with the more inclusive Weltmacht, was a duty, and to assure each man, as he gave up his watch, that of course 'Thou shalt not steal' is the law, but it does not apply in this case, as it 'would lead to a conflict of duties.' Bernhardi may save himself a lot of trouble, but he misses a lot of fun by not being able to laugh at such quaint intellectual acrobatics.

Humour is of varying qualities, grading from the delicately playful, through the sarcastic, to the cruel. But I have never yet seen an example so grim and sardonic as this new claim of Bernhardi. It really asserts that Bismarck, as forger,[35] and the Kaiser as traitor-spy,[36] as well as von Tirpitz, and Bernhardi

[34] A, p. 29.
[35] See reference 18; also reference 1, Section IV.
[36] Reference 21, Section IV.

himself, are only soulful Prussians, yearning for religious freedom ! He would have the world believe that for religious freedom alone, Prussia spends £780,000 per annum in Secret Service money, expended upon the missionary efforts of State brothels [37] in Berlin ; prostitute spies exported,[38] Stieber and his 30,000 spies in France in 1908,[39] Steinhauer and his unnumbered army of mental and other thieves in England,[40] and the public praise and thanks joyfully tendered by Herr von Puttkamer, the Minister of the Interior, in the Reichstag, and carried by the votes of the members to Police-councillor Rumpff [41] for his energetic prosecution of every one of the vilest blackguardisms that immoral genius can suggest. Each, and all, of these constitute but the pure tendrils of love, and the admirable aspirations of Prussia for religious freedom !

To attempt further comment would be to insult intelligence.

Regretfully leaving many other interesting clashes of pattern in the two productions, I must shortly sum up the position.

Bernhardi now claims : that his book, *Deutschland und der nächste Krieg* was really the purest milk of human kindness. It is no more altruistic now that he has diluted it. After his recent adulteration, apart from its unhealthy, anæmic condition, it is insipid, and on looking into the vessel within which it is purveyed for world-wide consumption, we find that it has been maliciously—if interestedly and 'by command'—so watered down, that the revolting unclean sediment of disease-producing mud at the bottom is revealed with even more startling horror.

There, we see the secret army document of 1913, with its plan of prostitution of German intellects, and its settled design of invasion of Belgium ; the Secret Service with its brothels, bribery and traitorism ; the Kaiser and his co-equal swindler at Buckingham Palace,

[37] Reference 10, Section IV. [38] Reference 11, Section IV.
[39] Reference 11, Section IV. [40] Reference 21, Section IV.
[41] Reference 12 and 13, Section IV.

standing out from the background of the foul swaying mass of duplicity, lying, and megalomania. Bernhardi has not mended matters by his ingenious attempts to transmute a vicious poison into pap. Nor has the 'all-highest' been really let down any more gently into the 'all-lowest.'

Although Carlyle declared that men were mostly fools, they are not so foolish as to believe that the putrescent and evil-smelling diet of the eagle-vulture is, in reality, only canary seed!

We had all recognised that the original fluid purveyed by Bernhardi & Co. consisted of the most intoxicating and maddening stimulants, calculated to subvert the intellects of the most sober participants, and to goad the bluster of the desperado into a delirium of violent raving.

We might even have credited him had his new claim been that it was really milk punch, that seductive fluid which seems to woo the palate when taken in the safe retreat of an arm-chair, but which demonstrates its insidious triumph by a staggering gait and perverted brain, as soon as this safe retreat is evacuated, or any activity attempted.

Now, the man who advertised and supplied this 'Kultur Nectar' declaims, with the corroboration of the supreme director of the whole emporium—that this nectar was in truth a new invention in infant food. We are entitled to insist that he and his superior had no right whatever to cultivate all those dangerous germs and deleterious debris which have been demonstrated beyond question to abound in all kultur goods from the same establishment. These goods have been recognised as totally 'unfit for human consumption' by everybody whose prudence outweighed their gullibility. This process of discrete attenuation and dilution of the commodity sold will only impress every invited consumer with the studied culpability, to say nothing of criminality of those who offered it for human consumption.

SECTION VII

REVIEW OF THE EVIDENCE, AND DEMAND FOR A VERDICT OF 'GUILTY'

Summing up of the case, and a demand for justice

NO doubt, various classes of critics will venomously attack those of us who will not be silenced by threats.

Other writers or speakers will probably be able to defend themselves more ably than I can, so that I do not presume to speak for anybody except myself.

Therefore, entirely upon my own behalf, I inform critics that a bare attack will have no force whatever. I insist that any statement which I have made, and which they desire to criticise or deny, must be specifically indicated, and that any denial or accusation of falsity in any single detail must be specifically made and supported by better and more unassailable evidence than that which I have given upon each particular point. Critics must prove their superiority in each instance.

Unless this is done in such material way as to destroy my whole case, I still hold the advantage.

In such a position I ask each critic definitely to state whether he maintains that the charges which still remain unshaken constitute a morality superior to the one for which I plead as a new dispensation in international relationships? Is each such critic content that all men should accept the morality he defends as the mirror of his own personal character? If not—why does he strive to maintain a political morality of which he is evidently personally ashamed?

Further, no critic will have the brazen effrontery to say that those of us who dare at the present time

publicly to discuss this subject do so from interested motives. What do we gain except insults and virulent abuse of interested partisans?

It is only when years of progress in the education of public opinion have taken place that even any spark of appreciation is born to the memory of any man who dares to run counter to official recognitions, or to question official conventionalities.

Amongst the various classes of critics or active opponents, I look for representatives of the following:—

The present-day descendants of the religious monopolists of former times, men who are as hopelessly mistaken in believing that their own class has any superiority which entitles them to retain diplomacy as their especial preserve, as they are in imagining that the intellectual and moral average of the various democracies is in any way inferior to their own.

Mingled with these are the men who will defend present conditions simply to maintain class prejudice and domination.

Probably the nearest imitation of righteous indignation and sanctimonious denunciation will come from those representing one or other of the financial interests which would suffer were future failures of diplomatic negotiations rendered impossible, and the present unceasingly engineered panics thus rendered as inexcusable and unattainable as they are now unprincipled and imbecile.

To all these critics my reply will be: Where you have proved that my statements are false by the production of stronger evidence than my own—you score.

Where you criticise my motive, and impugn my honesty of purpose, I shall retaliate by pointing out the object of my ambition, which is solely equal freedom of thought, knowledge and management of our own destinies for myself, the people at large, and these opponents themselves; and I shall insist upon my perfect right of inquiring into and publication of the ambition of each critic, so as to demonstrate whether he claims any unequal advantage as to social distinctions,

and ask; if so, upon what grounds; or whether his advocated maintenance of present conditions does not result, by direct or devious ways, in the preservation of some financial interest which would suffer diminution in proportion to the establishment of international justice and friendship.

So that there may be no mistake regarding this point, I will restate it: We who advocate the complete abandonment of present-day diplomacy, and the establishment of international co-operation and friendship, thereby suffer social and material loss, while our opponents entirely escape any loss. If there is to be any imputation of subsidised motives, we on our side are absolutely blameless.

We strive for new political conditions, which we hope will cause improvement in both social and material welfare, in absolutely equal amounts and directions, for ourselves, our opponents themselves, and every other member of our nation. We ask absolutely nothing for ourselves which we do not share in perfect equality with our opponents. Under these conditions it is nothing more than ordinary fair play that if our opponents derive any social or material benefits whatever from the maintenance of present conditions, they should disclose all these benefits specifically, with the same candour as we have done; and then share in just equality every benefit, social, material or financial; with us and the rest of our nation.

If they consider that this is a ridiculous suggestion—namely, to ask them to share equally with the rest of us the personal advantages they derive either socially or financially from international frictions—I reply that it would be as just as the present arrangement is unjust in imposing burdens of hatred and financial ruin upon all the rest of us, in order that they alone may mutually derive their benefits from fomented ill-will, and fratricidal strife. This is no time for social platitudes.

I accuse diplomacy, with its secrecy and false ideals, as the criminal author of the human holocaust now raging.

The niggling discussions of the drawing-room are futile.

The impartiality and impersonality of a Court of Justice are necessary. I do not claim that I have produced all the evidence possible, or advanced all the accusations which could be maintained, but I DO claim that there is quite sufficient for opponents to answer. Any *ex parte* statement will be no good. They must produce evidence to outweigh mine, and submit themselves to cross-examination.

When they have complied with these two essential conditions, I shall be content to leave the case to the juries of the democracies.

I make no claim to the discovery of any single fact or piece of evidence not accessible to every political student. Some of the evidence must have been known to every reader, and perhaps all of it to some readers. Still, a subject so complicated must be conscientiously questioned, analysed and demonstrated. Especially is this the case when it is a subject the study and examination of which has so far been regarded by a limited small and interested clique as their especial preserve. This idea is carried to an amusing limit. The majority of diplomats regard the demand of any democrat to take personal interest in the bartering of his own destiny under the secrecy of tinselled uniforms, dispatch boxes and *persona grata* ideas of rectitude with the same comical expression of speechless indignation as they would exhibit did they behold a navvy, carrying the latest pattern gun, tramping across their family estate, and making excellent practice at their sporting, as contrasted with their political, game.

Unfortunately the democracies have not yet recognised that their whole destinies are centred within this forbidden 'Tom Tiddler's ground.' Each honest endeavour to examine and explain such a subject is valuable, although it may not have any merit of discovery.

No two presentations can be exactly similar, any more than any two thumb-prints. Each exponent presents a different spectrum effect, as he paints the various lights as seen from his personal standpoint. Granted that he paints honestly, and only presents the

colours actually shown from his especial point of view, his resulting picture is undeniably true, and by its novelty, unconventionality, or even eccentricity, the painter may appeal to, and stimulate the interest of some whose mental activities have not been touched by former presentations, though more competent or classical.

It is to such a presentation of diplomacy that I lay claim. I have not painted a single colour which is not present in the original, nor intensified one tint deeper than nature.

If I have painted in a searching light which throws up the lines and blemishes in the portrait, I am not responsible for any single one of them. They are all definitely present in the original, and the portrait is no more severe, or even repulsive, than the original which sat for the likeness.

I do not believe in painting any portrait in the dark, or with colours intensified in the high lights, while the shadows are discreetly omitted, and then putting the dishonest picture into an elaborate and gaudy gilt frame which attracts the admiration of the multitude thus beguiled from criticising the canvas, while it panders to the vanity of the original, who mistakes the glittering attraction of the frame for worship of his own symbolical beauty.

I have preferred to treat the subject of diplomacy from a position more like that of 'Counsel for the Crown' in our Assize Courts.

In such cases there is supposed to be no personal bias, no interest whatever as prosecutor. It is this Counsel's duty to present points in favour of the accused with honesty equal to that with which he demands impartial justice and a verdict upon the evidence of the prisoner's guilt. I do not state the case as against any set of men, or any individual man. I maintain that it is the system of diplomacy which is on trial. I claim that the evidence proves that this pernicious system, known as diplomacy, is of such a character that no man who has to do with it, be he never so honest and upright,

can exercise his honesty and uprightness, any more than he could execute a bee-line through the Hampton Court Maze.

I have also proved that any man who desires to work by lying, duplicity and actual criminality cannot be controlled by the honest men, and that he enjoys absolute immunity from criticism, judgment or punishment through the diplomatic secrecy which is observed by his co-workers through the tradition of a horribly mistaken honour which shields the plotter of international murders, yet vents its neurotic morality upon an accessory before the fact in the case of some sordid domestic tragedy; and in the exercise of this parody of virtue, hides the actions of the most callous or criminal diplomatic disaster-maker even from the knowledge of those democracies whose ruin he may have engineered.

In Section I. we found that even the most conscientious leaders of the democracies have not yet penetrated to the true root of the troubles they recognise, and desire to correct. We see that nationality is still only the one remaining strata covering the only immovable sub-lying rock of humanity. This almost-solid strata of nationality, either by the slow process of the natural penetration and permeation of trade-bearing streams, or by some violent convulsion of the many overlying strata, may slide and obliterate the frontier markings, even though now elaborately readjusted with national measurements. There is no definite fixed quantity except the basal humanity, and only upon this foundation may various communities of men erect any enduring superstructure, embodying any desired national architectural characteristics.

In Section II. it was proved that the diplomatists themselves were chosen from a too limited class of men, whose interests and restricted knowledge of national life handicapped their fitness for their task. Also that the paths and ancient circuitous routes of diplomatic negotiations rendered it impossible for even the best diplomat to steer an even approximately straight course, while ties of antiquated customs often

dragged him, fettered, at the heels of any perverse wanderer.

It was shown that, apart from restricted selection from a class of men doubtfully competent, the secret dictatorship conferred upon diplomatists resulted in disaster whenever the personality of even one single man was both strong and malevolent.

Examples of disasters, due to combined natural incompetence and class prejudice, were found in the Vienna Congress of 1814, and the blundering which lost us America.

Many disasters may be traced to the devilment of the 'one strong malevolent man'—viz. Lord Stafford de Redcliffe and the Crimean War; Bismarck and the Franco-German War. And amongst others responsible for the present uncivilised atrocities in Europe, we may note the Austrian Minister and his ridiculous conditions of the ultimatum, the 'changed personality' of the Kaiser, and the Turkish Minister for War.

In Section III. it was demonstrated that the natural result of such conditions was that from time to time the immunity from restraint and the disguise of secrecy fostered abuses culminating in swindling and crimes which in national life would be rewarded with imprisonment even in primitive civilisation. Also that the immorality and despicable meanness actually consummated by those occupying the highest positions of State would be a disgrace to savages, or even to the higher animal creation.

Common forgery by Bismarck; swindling by illegal conspiracy and the suppression of telegrams; common theft of passports; the assiduous cultivation of prostitution for all classes in all countries; bribery, suborning of the Press, corruption, spying and traitorism were regarded as commendable qualifications to be cultivated; and the whole moral tone was debased far enough to approve of them. That ethics consisted in altering the injunction to 'Make peace with thine adversary while he is in the way' into 'Hate and swindle thy national neighbour while he is in any way

at all'; and the advice to 'Turn the other cheek to the smiter' is not so dangerously impracticable as its substitute, 'Stick a knife into thy international brother wherever you get the chance, especially when he is unaware, helpless, or—if strong—entangled elsewhere' is blackguardly and as futile as it is insane.

Section V. illustrated the dangerous perverted instincts which may arise and be cultivated, even by men of the highest intellect, through the hypnotising effect of traditional respect for ancient formulas, and the distortion resulting from regarding international relationships through the false optical lens handed down from primitive times.

It also demonstrated that there is no blindness, either physical or moral, which is so hopeless as that which either cannot or will not see the one most obvious and recognisable object in the psychological universe—*i.e.* the ineradicable bond which binds all men into a universal brotherhood.

Even otherwise intelligent men grope about in this blindness, grubbing for any and every expedient or instrument to adjust international relationships; and with psychological imbecility even staking their all upon the Bedlam-born scheme of winning the sympathy and co-operation of each and any international brother, by slaying him—not because of inherent hatred, but with calculated annihilation of human reason, and deification or the utmost magnification of the basest animal passions to which they can debase the human race.

On each and all of these lines of evidence I claim that what we now know as diplomacy is nothing more than a convicted fraud, a swindler of mankind, and a traitorous assassin of the morality and progress of the human race.

Nothing needs reformation except the system itself.

Let the motive power be reason and truth and the operations be performed in the light of day instead of subterranean darkness, and all will be well.

Every honest diplomat will rejoice at his new-found

freedom, and his renewed hope; while every dishonest diplomat will be rendered impotent for disaster to his fellow-men.

Upon this evidence I claim the verdict of all democracies, and call upon every honest man who recognises his duties to coming generations to assert his individual power so that no interested partisan, no financial gambler, no coward cringing before an antiquated fetish; no irresponsible blitherer who cannot reason, but who can still yell his national hates, may attempt to preserve such an immoral incubus as diplomacy.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL

FEB 18 1972
REC'D LD-URL

LD URL

MAR 22 1972

MAR 20 1972

Form L9–Series 444

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 717 234 9